TRIBAL AND PLACE NAMES AMONG THE ARABO-BERBERS OF NORTHWESTERN MOROCCO

A PRELIMINARY STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

— I —

Many Moroccans assert that the dialect(s) of Arabic which they speak is (are) very different from those dialects spoken, for instance, in Egypt and the Near East. This is certainly true, but not necessarily for the reason they give : the heavy influence upon their own dialect(s) of what they call « *Shilḥa Barbarīya* », e,g., North African Berber. That this claim is grossly exaggerated, at least with respect to a « working vocabulary », was demonstrated many years ago by certain French Arabists (1). The influence of Berber on Maghribī Arabic is, *in toto*, very slight indeed, but the reverse is not the case at all. Although degrees of Arabic influence on each of the three major Moroccan Berber dialects (Rīfian, Brābir and Sūsī) are « differential » from a regional standpoint, they are nonetheless considerable, if not strong, in all three instances, manifesting themselves primarily through superimposition of lexical elements on the autochnous vocabulary ; and today, if anything, they are on the increase.

The often repeated truism that in the Moroccan « bled », Arabs live (and Arabic is spoken) in the plains (and, of course, in the cities), and that Berbers live (and Berber is spoken) in the mountains, is not only

(1) I think the reference in this case is *Archives Marocaines*, vol. I, but I am not sure. I have written this article while in the field (Central Rīf) and without any regular access to the necessary source material, for which I offer due apologies to the reader. Such further citations without page references, etc., will also reflect this fact.

factually inaccurate ; it is seriously misleading. In the first place, Berber is spoken, for example, by the Zimmūr tribe in the plains around Tīflat and Khmīsāt, east of Rabat; in most of the « presaharan » oasis areas south of the Atlas ; and in the open rolling country and flat arid Gāriṭ steppe in the Eastern Rīf. Arabic, on the other hand, is spoken by almost all the mountaineers in the western half of the Rīfian clain, by the people who are called Jbāla and Ghmāra. In the second place, this point of view, to my own way of thinking, is highly static and conceptually crude, for it implies that the phenomena of contact and change are negligible or nonexistent. The reverse, in fact, is the case : Arab-Berber relations have been in a constant state of flux because of the very fact that the two peoples have been living in juxtaposition for over a millennium. Indeed, I heartily endorse the opinion recently expressed by Marvin Mikesell in a personal communication : that the so-called Arab-Berber « division » is not a division at all, but a *process* (my italics) (2).

The western half of the Rīfian chain, the tribal (as well as clan and lineage) and place names of which form the subject of this paper, is an area which illustrates Mikesell's concept of « process » very nicely. With the exception of a small part of Ghmāra (3), the whole region is Arabic-speaking ; and its inhabitants may be considered perhaps the classic example of « Arabo-Berbers ». (The Ṣanhāja Srīr (4) or « Gun-stock »

(2) Personal communication, October 16, 1959. Mikesell states that in a paper he read on this topic at a geographers' meeting in April of the same year, he concluded with these lines : « Wherever Arabic has replaced Berber, there also Qur'ānic law has replaced the old tribal order. In such areas one can no longer speak of « Berbers », but neither can one speak of « Arabs » in the sense of Arabians or Levantines. The cultural dichotomy now evident in North Africa is the result of a long process of assimilation. The forces responsible for this process are analogous to those responsible for the Hispanization of Latin America. This analogy is reasonable, for the number of Arabians in the Atlas is probably no larger than the number of Spaniards in the Andes ».

I disagree in two places with Mikesell's choice of worlds, if I understand them aright : Qur'ānic law has not deplaced « the old tribal order », but rather the old Berber legal system (and in some cases not entirely so), in the areas under consideration ; and the analogy with « Arabians » and « Levantines » loses some of its force because most Levantines are no more « Arab » (in the narrow, peninsular Arabian, sense of the word) than most North Africans are. However, these are minor points ; and I certainly support his general conclusion.

(3) G.S. Colin, « Le parler berbère des Ġmāra », *Hespéris*, 1929, pp. 43-58 ; Fernando Valdfrrama Martinez, *Manual del Maestro Español en la Escuela Marroquí*, 2nd Ed., Tetuán, 1955 ; and Julio Caro Baroja, « Una Encuesta en Gomara : Historia y Tradición », in J. Caro Baroja, *Estudios Mogrebíes*, Madrid, 1957, pp. 123-141.

(4) For a tribe-by-tribe, clan-by-clan and lineage-by-lineage speech breakdown in the Ṣanhāja Srīr, as well as for the predominantly Arabic-speaking groups of the Western (or Modified or Transitional) Rīf, see F.S. Vidal, « Ensayo sobre lingüística en el Rif Occidental », *Africa*, Madrid, 1945.

Ṣanhāja (5) area just west of the Rīf proper is rather a different matter : a predominantly Berber-speaking congeries of tribes among which there are strong Arabic elements.)

For better or for worse, the term « Arabo-Berber », meaning a person who speaks Arabic but who is descended from Berbers, seems to have become a standard one in the literature. It is a designation which I find both disturbing and challenging, because of the implied questions it asks : *when* (and also, on a local level, *why, how* and *where*) did the linguistic shift occur ? These questions, basic to any study of Northwest Morocco, have not yet been satisfactorily answered, although Augustin Bernard and

(5) An etymology proposed by Professor G.S. Colin (and later confirmed by Gérard Maurer) in onversation with the author in Rabat, October 20, 1959. Fairly closely associated with it is another etymology, that of « Wood Ṣanhāja », proposed by Eduardo Maldonado (pseud. Et-Tabyi), *Retazos de Historia Marroquí*, Tetuan, 1955. The Ṣanhāja Srīr is the highest and most heavily wooded area in Northern Morocco, and in pre-contact times, its mountains supplied the timber necessary for the stocks of fiintlock guns. Both the stocks and the barrels were made by the members of one of its constituent tribes, Taghzūt, whose people, gunsmiths (formerly), woodcarvers and leatherworkers, are the most highlt specialized in the Moroccan North, and go far afield to ply their trades. José Erola, the former tribal administrator of Aith Waryāghar in the Rīf, told me that he ran into a Taghzūtī in Dakar, during World War II.

While on the subject of Ṣanhāja, it might not be out of place to give a critical appraisal here to a classification of Berbers which has been in vogue now for a century, and which has been generally accepted by the majority of French Berberists ever since Baron MacGuckin de Slane's translation of ibn Khaldūn's *Histoire des Berbères* in 1859 : the Maṣmūda-Ṣanhāja-Zanāta trichotomy. In a recent review of an otherwise highly sophisticated little book by G.-H. Bousquet (*Les Berbères*, series « Que Sais-Je ? », Paris, 1957), Ernest Gellner expressed some doubt the validity of this classification and implied that throught it, certain French scholars (notably, I should add, E.-F. GAUTIER, *Le Passé de l'Afrique du Nord*, 2nd Ed., Paris, 1942) tended to view Berber history in the Middle Ages as a trilateral tug of war rather than through the concept of balance and opposition between tribes and central governments. I echo this doubt ; and, applying it to the linguistic realm, it may be said that although in 1927 E. Laoust (« Le Dialecte berbère du Rif », *Hespéris*, 1927) labeled the Rifian dialect « Zanātan », most Rīfians, in my experience, have no idea whatsoever about such a classification. Gellner has informed me in conversation that the same goes for the « Brabir » of the Middle, Central and Eastern High Atlases regarding the term « Ṣanhāja » ; only the little northern groups of Ṣanhāja (Muṣbaḥ, Ghaddū and Srīr, the first two of which are entirely Arabic-speaking) consciously use the designation « Ṣanhāja » (supposed to be derived from Berber *Iznāgan* — there are at least two lineages claiming this name in the « Zanātan » Rīf, on in Asht Tūzīn and one in the Jbil of Aith Wariyāghar ; they are « brothers », and their tradition myths take them both back to Ikhuwānen of the Igzinnāyen) to describe themselves. Given this slender and tenuous kind of evidence, can we automatically assume that the dialect of Ṣanhāja Srīr, for instance, is « closely related » to that of the Middle Atlas ?

The Maṣmūda-Ṣanhāja-Zanāta scheme may well have had some conceptual validity in ibn Khaldūn's day, but, even if so, this is no reason to suppose that it does today. (André Adam, personal communication, November 17, 1959, supports the M-S-Z classification as a key to understanding medieval Maghribi history, but agrees that it can hardly be invoked at the present time.) Certainly it has no relevance, structural or functional, in present Berber thought or traditions. Perhaps I am stepping on a few toes in this connection, and also, by throwing the problem open for discussion, I may just be adding fuel to the old anthropological argument about the role of history vis-à-vis that of function ; but to me, at any rate, the concept completely lacks any convincing reality, and I would tend to view it more as a « three-ring circus » than as a trichotomy in the proper sense of the word. I do not know what attitude the present generation of Berberists have adopted regarding it ; but the late André Basset, in his *La Langue berbère*, London, 1952, made no mention of it. Perhaps his silence is a testimony to his opinion.

Paul Moussard (6), Henri Terrasse (7), and G.-S. Colin (8) have all made admirable attempts to sequentialize and summarize the scanty evidence available ; their findings will be discussed further on. Since they worked on the problem, it has, to my knowledge, lain largely fallow ; but it seems to me, at least, that a resuscitation would be profitable and that some interesting results might possibly be achieved through the application of glottochronological techniques, as developed by American linguists (notably Swadesh and Greenberg) in the last decade.

I do not intend to develop this idea here, however, for the techniques of linguistic paleontology have been reviewed elsewhere ; and I hasten to add that I am in no position to discuss them with any degree of competence, much less to apply them. (I am not a specialist in linguistics and humbly offer this essay as a possible springboard for future research on the part of more qualified scholars.) However, while I think everyone would agree that fluctuation and change are two major features of languages in general, there are nonetheless certain linguistic phenomena which tend, on the other hand, to remain constant over relatively long periods of time. Among these phenomena are certain ones of great interest to anthropologists : kinship terms, and names, both of people (by which I refer particularly to human social groups : families, lineages, clans and tribes) and of places. And I feel quite sure that a statistical analysis of such names in Northwestern Morocco might eventually prove of value to present or future workers competent in matters of linguistic dating by means of glottochronological or other techniques.

The fact is that although Northwestern Morocco is now almost entirely Arabic-speaking, and that parts of it have been for over a thousand years,

(6) A. Bernard and P. Moussard, « Arabophones et Berbérophones au Maroc », *Annales de Géographie*, vol. XXXIII, 1924, pp. 267-282.

(7) H. Terrasse, « Les Arabophones du Nord », in *Rif et Jbala*, Paris, 1926.

(8) G.S. Colin, « Les Parlers : l'Arabe », in *Initiation au Maroc*, Rabat, 1942, pp. 135-53. See also Isidro de las Cagigas, *Andalucía Musulmana : Aportaciones a la Delimitación de la Frontera del Andalus (Ensayo de Etnografía Andaluza Medieval)*, Madrid, 1950, p. 59, who says, paraphrasing Colin (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, III, p. 335), that not only were the Jbāla and Ghmāra the first occupants of the territory from Ceuta to Shāwen, and on toward the east, but that they were the first to become Arabized, about the 10th century A.D. This is an obvious oversimplification of the matter, and in one respect it is a misstatement of fact : the Arabization of the Ghmāra occurred, most probably, centuries later. De las Cagigas does, however, qualify his statement by saying that we must look on these phenomena with caution, as many of the members of this northern group were originated later by Andalusian Muslims who passed through Northern Morocco or even by Moroccans who returned home after a more or less long stay in Spain.

the result, largely, of its having been a major « contact zone » between the Iberian Peninsula and the North African mainland, it shows strong vestiges (or « survivals », to resurrect a hackneyed term) of former Berber speech through the abundant evidence provided by the names of tribes, clans and lineages or villages. The Berber elements in these names, also, tend to become more and more marked the further east, toward the Rīf proper, that one proceeds. In this region, furthermore, the names of at least two cities, Tetuan and Shāwen, are Berber : the former, prononced *Tsiṭṭāwn* by its inhabitants, is derived from Rīfian *dhīṭṭāwīn*, « eyes » (9), the term referring, I have heard, to some period (indeterminate, but may have been 17th and/or 18th centuries A.D.) in the city's history when it was under Rīfian overlordship, and when its inhabitants had to « keep quiet and keep their eyes open », in order to avoid trouble ; and the latter is derived from another Rīfian word, *ashshawn* (sing. *ashshau*), « horns », referring, very likely, to the horn-like twin peaks of Jbil Magū, just over 2000 meters high, under which the town is sheltered.

— II —

Before proceeding to the statistical analysis of Arabic and Berber frequency ratios in the tribal, clan and village names in Northwestern Morocco which will form the core of this article, I wish first to discuss, in turn, three separate but related problems which all bear strongly on the matter at hand. These are : 1) a summary of what is know historically of the Arabization of the area ; 2) a résumé of Arabic and Berber speech distribution, on a tribe by tribe basis, as it exists throughout

(9) *Not* « springs », as Fernando Valderrama Martinez, « El Culto de Fuentes en Tetuán », in Miguel Tarradell, Ed. : *I Congreso Arqueológico del Marruecos Español, 22-6 Junio 1953*, Tetuán, 1954, pp. 491-500 ; Ernst Rackow, *Beiträge zur materiellen Kultur Nordwest-Marokkos*, Wiesbaden, 1958 ; and Nevill Barbour, Ed., *A Survey of North-West Africa*, London, 1959, p. 8, have all suggested. The Rīfian words for « springs » are quite different : *thaṛīwīn* (sing. *thaṛa*), *ṛ-ᶜanāṣar* (sing. *ṛ-ᶜanṣar*), or *ṛ-mzūyāb* (sing. *ṛ--mīzāb*). I have questioned both Rīfians and Tetuanis about the etymology of the name « Tetuan », and all are agreed on this matter (cf. Muḥammad Dāwud, *Ta'rīkh Titṭāwan*, Tetuan, 1956). I believe that the confusion has arisen from the fact that in Arabic (*not* in Berber), *ᶜayn* means both « eye » and « spring2» — but it is the *dual* form, *ᶜaynayn*, which means « eyes », and the *plural*, *ᶜayūn*, which means « springs » ; while the singular form of Rīfian *dhīṭṭāwīn*, e.g., *dhīṭ*, however, not only means « eye », but, in a figurative sense, « anus », as well To call a man « *mmīs n dhīṭ* », in the Rīf, is a very great insult.

Northern Morocco at the present day ; and 3) some general comments on the nature of the names themselves and on certain anthropological problems of a structural kind which underly them. I feel that an understanding of these problems will provide a greater perspective and appreciation, both in breadth and in depth, of an area which, as Professor Colin has so rightly remarked, is « incredibly complex ».

In general terms, the linguistic Arabization of Morocco may be considered to fall into two distinct periods which correspond roughly with the country's ethnic Arabization : 1) the first Arab invasions of the 8th century A.D., and 2) the deportation to Morocco, at the end of the 12th century, of the Banū Hilāl from Tunisia, and the later entry, dating from the 15th and 16th centuries, of the Maᶜqīl. The first period is that of a small and elite group of conquerors ; the second, that of a horde of illiterate Bedouins, who overran and devastated the area to such an extent as to merit the famous comparison which ibn Khaldūn made of them to « a swarm of locusts ». Let us take up what historical evidences we have for each of these invasions, and their effect on the northwestern part of the country, in turn.

In the first place, since the end of the 7th century, the area under consideration here had been in contact with the soldiers of ᶜUqba b. Nāfiᶜ and of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr. And ever since the first appearance of Arabs on the scene, the Arabization of the northwestern tribes had been favored by various political factors : the persecution in the 10th century by Mūsā b. Abī l-ᶜĀfya of the Idrīsī shurfā of Fez, which caused the latter to seek refuge in the mountains of the Jbāla ; the furnishing by the Jbālan tribes of most of the Moroccan army contingents which the sultans took with them on their holy wars in Spain, these contingents eventually returning home more or less Arabized through their contact with the Arabs of Andalusia ; and the revolts and civil wars, such a frequent occurrence in Muslim Spain, introducing as they did an Arabic-speaking element of urban origin (including the founders of Tetuan and Shāwen) into the northwestern mountains, which no doubt had a great effect on the local population; while the people living in the western Atlantic plains left their homeland when the Almohad caliph al-Manṣūr settled the Riyāḥ Arabs there, and were doubled back into the mountains. Finally, in the 15th century, as

a results of the Ṣūfī mysticism which gave rise to most or all of the religious brotherhoods represented in the country today, innumerable families of shurfā established themselves in the Jbāla. Ribāṭs and zāwiyas multiplied when the Christian invader appeared upon the banks of the Lukkūs River ; many marabouts sprang up, « and in the tribe of Bnī Gurfāṭ, they formed a veritable clan of *mujāhidīn* » (10).

The second phase of Arabization, insofar as our area is concerned, was really nothing more than a continuation of the first. The last major segment of the Bedouin invaders, the Maᶜqīl from southern Arabia, began to make its weight felt in Morocco in the first half of the 16th century. During this period, the Saᶜdid sultans brought their Maᶜqīl mercenaries into the plains of Marrakesh ; the latter began life in their new home by opposing themselves to the Banū Hilāl elements, already there, who still supported the last of the Marīnids. The Hilālīs were beaten, and were relegated to the Gharb, where they constitute the present tribes of l-Khlūṭ, Sufyān and Bnī Malik; and « toward the end of the 16th century, Arabophone Morocco as we know it today was almost completely constituted » (11).

Perhaps the central point which emerges from the historical vicissitudes outlined above is the fact that the Jbālan area was the highway to Spain par excellence ; it was called al-Habṭ, « the descent », for it led the conquerors of Andalusia right down to the sea. Of the Jbālans, Mármol wrote : « they are the mortal enemies of the Christians, and they were the best troops which the Kings of Granada had in the wars in Spain » (12). The Habṭ also received many counterwaves of Muslim emigres from Europe, whatever their motives, as indicated above. After 814, with the expulsion of part of the population of Córdoba, refugees came to establish themselves in Ceuta and Tetuan. Many, many others followed in the grand exodus which began in the 14th century and lasted until the 17th. In the words of Bernard and Moussard, « the Jbāla, like the Tāza Corridor, is a region of passage, and this is why it became Arabic-speaking » (13).

(10) Bernard and Moussard, *op. cit.*, 1924, p. 272.
(11) Colin, *op. cit.*, 1942, p. 138.
(12) Luis Mármol del Carvajal, *L'Afrique*, trad. Perrot d'Ablancourt, Paris, 1667, vol. II, p. 244, cited by Bernnard and Moussard, *op. cit.*, 1924, p. 272.
(13) Bernard and Moussard, *op. cit.*, 1924, p. 275.

Colin, however, has more to say than Bernard and Moussard regarding the historical background of Arabic dialect differentiation in the northern area. He distinguishes four subdialects : that of the cities, that of the mountaineers, that spoken by Bedouins, and that spoken by Jews. The main cities with proper city speakers are Fez, Rabat, Salé, Tetuan, Tāza and al-Qṣar al-Kbīr ; and although Tangier, Shāwen and Wazzān also have city speakers, their speech is trongly influenced (14) by that of the mountaineers. Meknes and Marrakesh, on the other hand, show Bedouin inflluences (15).

We are only concerned here with mountaineer speech, which Colin divides into two groups, northern and southern. The *northern mountain speakers* are the *Jbāla proper*, extending from the Strait of Gibraltar to south of Shāwen, and including, toward the east, the present confederation of Ghmāra. Almost all of them thus fall into the « North Zone » of Morocco, and, indeed, into the present province of Tetuan. A tribe-by-tribe enumeration will be given in the next section. The *southern mountain speakers* or *Southern Jbāla*, extending from Wazzan to Taza, include the Wargha River Ṣanhāja (the Ṣanhāja Musbah and Ṣanhāja Ghaddū groups, which Colin equates with the « Ṣanhāja of the Sun » — *Ṣanhājat al-Shams* — and « Ṣanhāja of the Shade » — *Ṣanhājat al-Ẓall* — respectively (16), and such Arabic-speaking tribes as Marnīsa, Brānis (17), Dsūl, Maghrāwa and Miknāsa, north of Tāza (18). These tribes Colin labels « Zanātan-related », and thinks that neither they nor the neighboring Ṣanhāja became

(14) Colin uses the term « contaminated ». COLIN, *op. cit.*, 1942, p. 140.

(15) COLIN, *op. cit.*, 1942, p. 140. For a general, historically oriented survey of this problem, see also William MARÇAIS, « Comment l'Afrique du Nord a été arabisée — II : L'arabisation des campagnes », *Annales de l'Institut des Etudes orientales, Faculté des Lettres à l'Université d'Alger*, tome XIV, Algiers, 1956, pp. 5-17. Marçais' discussion, however, is centered around the Arabization of the Tunisian and Algerian countrysides rather than that of Morocco.

(16) The « Ṣanhāja of the Sun » and « Ṣanhāja of the Shade » is another classification, relating primarily to Berber tribes in the Middle and Eastern High Atlases, which is ultimately based on ibn Khaldūn, and which seems to me of as dubious a validity today as the Maṣmūda-Ṣanhāja-Zanāta trichotomy from which it emerged.

(17) According to Bernard and Moussard (*op. cit.*, 1924, p. 270), Brānis contains two Rifian speaking subsegments, Ūlād Ḥaddū and Jbārna. These border the Rifian tribe of Igzinnāyen, from whose lowland clan of Asht ṛ-Ūdha they originally came.

(18) I do not have a proper listing available for the southern Jbālan tribes at the date of writing ; and the material in this article is in any case only concerned with the northern group.

established in their present habitat until well after the first Arab conquest; and « the Ṣanhāja of the Middle Wargha almost certainly occupied territories populated by Ghmārans prior to the Almoravid dynasty » (19).

This, then, is the evidence for Colin's belief that the northern group has been Arabized for a longer time than the southern. He considers that the differences between the two groups stem from two causes : 1) an evolution of neighboring urban speakers which came about during the space of time separating the Arabization of the Ghmāra (and Jbāla) from that of the Ṣanhāja-Zanāta — a point which conflicts with the view of Caro Baroja that the Arabization of the Ghmāra was a different phenomenon entirely and did not occur until the 16th-18th centuries A.D. (20) ; and 2) the non-identity of the Berber substrata, which he considers « Maṣmūdan » or « Ghmāran » in the first instance and « Ṣanhājan-Zanātan » in the seconds; and there might possibly be a third and subsidiary cause, that of an undeniably Latin lexical element in the Northwestern Jbāla, which Colin himself has discussed elsewhere (21).

(19) Colin, *op. cit.*, 1942, p. 140.

(20) Caro Baroja, *op. cit.*, 1957 ; and personal communication, May 23, 1960, in which he states that Mármol in the 16th century spoke of the Ghmāra as Berbers with customs completely contrary to the spirit of Islam. One need only recall the false Ghmārī prophet Ḥāmīm (d. 927), who not only wrote a Qur'ān in Berber, but took every possible kind of liberty with the original text, and allowed the eating of pork.

(21) G.S. Colin, « Etymologies maġribines », *Hespéris*, n° II, 1926, pp. 55-82 ; n° I, 1927, pp. 85-102. In this article, Colin adduces as evidence for his belief that, in the area concerned, a number of words were borowed from Latin, the relative frequency of village and lineage names which terminate in *-esh*. This suffix, Colin says, can be equated with the Latin third declension nominative plural ending *-es*. When added to names of individuals (e.g., names *per se* and patronymics), this suffix indicates a lineage or village name (1926, pp. 63 8).

Such names, and Colin presents us with 22 in all, are geographically concentrated in the area between Tangier, l-Qṣar l-Kbīr, Shāwen and Ceuta. The French savant thinks the theory of a Hispano-Roman origin the only acceptable one, for the geographical distribution of *-esh* villages corresponds to the part of Morocco most directly and longest in contact with Roman civilization first, and then with Hispano-Roman from the Iberian peninsula. The only example of the employment of this sufix in another part of the Maghrib, he says, in *Mshūnesh*, an oaṣis in the southern Aures of Algeria (I have also found ʿAin Girnūnesh near Rummāni in the Zaʿir tribal territory about 100 km. from Rabat), and he invokes several distributional hypotheses to account for its presence both there and in the Jbāla (n° I, 1927, pp. 98-100) : 1) that a plural suffix *-esh*, of Latin origin, was in general usage in North Africa before the Arabe conquest and that it fell into disuse afterwards and was only preserved in the Aures and the Jbāla ; 2) that it was borrowed independently in each of these regions ; or 3) that its usage was peculiar to the Eastern Maghrib, and that following their migrations to the west, the Kutāma tribe (mentioned by al-Bakrī and ibn Khaldūn) brought it from their point of origin in Eastern Algeria and introduced it into the northwestern Moroccan massif where Roman influence was much less felt. I myself do not feel sufficiently versed in the question to comment upon any of these hypotheses, but should from strictly an *a priori* standpoint be inclined to support the second rather than the first or third.

In any event, the tribal distribution of Colin's *-esh* names in the Jbāla is as follows : Anjra - 10 ; Jbil Ḥbīb - 10 (*Failālesh*, which I was unable to find in the Jbil Ḥbīb listing I consulted, but which I did find in Bnī Yīdir) ; Bnī Ḥuzmar - 4 (of which I found only one, *Ḥmāmīwesh* (derived from *Hmāmū* a diminutive form of the Berber man's name *Ḥammū*), in the work I consulted); Bni ᶜArūs - 2 (of which only one, *Arārīwesh*, is in my listing) ; Bnī Gurfāṭ - 1 (*Ghailānīyesh*, meaning *l-Ghailānīyīn* or *Ūlād Ghailān*, not the same as either of the two I found) ; Ahl Srīf - 1 (my listing gives none at all for that tribe) ; Bnī Mstāra - 1 (*Rhūnīyesh* — my listing, which covers only the North Zone, does not include this tribe) ; l-Khmās - 1 ; and Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq - 1. Colin states that the examples from Bnī Mstāra, l-Khmās and Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq, in the southeastern Jbāla, are probably foreign lineages who came from some of the previously mentioned tribes on the list, to the northwest ; and my own finding on the distribution of *-esh* names tend to bear this out very strongly.

My own compilation (taken from Alta Comisaría de España en Marruecos, *Nombres de los Musulmanes Habitantes en la Zona de Protectorado de España en Marruecos : Territorios, Kabilas, Fracciones y Poblados de la Misma*, Tetuán, 1955, pp. 39-67) not only bears out, in general, but considerably amplifies the data presented by Colin. The total number of *-esh* names which I encountered, in just the same general area as that delimited by Colin, is 64.

These are distributed as follows (and I should add that I have counted, where applicable, the occurrence of the same name more than once in the same tribe according to the *number* of times it occurs) :

I) *Anjra - total 18 :* Bilᶜaishīsh, Bghīlesh, Shaᶜirīyesh, ᶜAzībīyesh, Khlīᶜash, Izmizmesh, Dār Ṭwīlesh, Lishqrash and s-Saᶜdīyesh, in the clan of l-Barqūqīyīn ; Htatesh, Dār ᶜAyyādesh and Bilyūnesh (Sp. *Bullones*, from Lat. *bunyolex*, « vineyard », according to Colin, nº I, 1926, pp. 59-60), in the clan of *l-Ghābāwīyīn* ; and Mālīyesh l-Fūqī, Mālīyesh s-Siflī, Ghzīlesh, Lanjrīyesh, Bilᶜaishīsh Milwān and Nwinwesh (the lastest-mentioned being actually one of four Anjra villages located in the Tangier Province), in the clan of *l-Baḥrāwīyīn*.

II) *Wadrās - total 6 :* Silmūnesh and Ziyānesh, in the clan of *Rbaᶜ l-Wisṭī* ; Tawītesh and ᶜAllālesh, in the clan of *Bū Maṭṭāsh* ; and Izbaᶜīresh and Hmīmdesh, in the clan of *ᶜAin l-Qṣāb*.

III) *Bnī Mṣawwar - total 6 :* Būghābesh, ᶜAshwīyesh, Buḥdīdesh, Yaᶜqūbesh, Būlīfesh, and Ḥamadesh, all in the clan of *l-Ḥā'iṭ l-Fūqī*.

IV) *Jbil Ḥbīb - total 3 :* Akhshābesh and r-Rūsīyesh, in the clan of *l-Ḥā'iṭ l-Fūqī* ; and Ḥammīwesh, in the clan of *l-Ḥā'iṭ s-Siflī*.

V) *Bnī Yīdir - total 13 :* Krākesh, Fīlālesh (cited by Colin for Jbil Ḥbīb), Ḥlīmīyesh, Ḥassānīwesh and Ḥayūnesh, in the clan of *s-Sabṭrīyīn* ; l-Khalānjīyesh, in the clan of *l-ᶜAnṣar* ; and Qurrīresh, Ashqarīyesh, Aᶜbūdesh, ᶜArūqesh, ᶜAtmānesh, Akhlūfesh, and Khandaq ᶜAshīyesh, in the clan of *Saitūla*.

VI) *Bnī Ḥuzmar - total 2 :* Dār Zkīyesh, in the clan of *l-W'ād* ; Ḥmāmīwesh, in the clan of *Bnī Rātin*.

VII) *l-Gharbīya - total 1* (a non-Jbālan, Atlantic Coast tribe, descended from Bedouins) : Brīyesh, in the clan of *Ūlād Khālūf*.

VIII) *Bnī Gurfāṭ - total 3 :* Shifrāwesh, in the clan of *Shifrāwesh* (thus counting as two) ; and Lahresh, in the clan of *l-Khṭūṭ*.

IX) *Bnī ᶜArūs - total 5 :* ᶜAyyādesh, in the clan of *Bni Wumrās* ; Ḥammādesh, Arārīwesh, and l-ᶜAmrīyesh, in the clan of *Urā' ḍ-Dhār* ; and l-Hāresh, in the clan of *Yarkūd*.

X) *Bnī Būzra - total 2* (a largely Berber-speaking tribe in the Ghmāra) : Jnānesh, in the clan of *l-Wisṭīyīn* ; and Jnānesh, again, in the clan of *Bnī Mūsā*.

XI) *l-Khmās s-Siflī - total 4 :* Ahlālesh and l-Mrābṭīyesh, in the clan of *Bnī Zarwīl* ; l-ᶜAshāyish, in the clan of *Bnī Jbāra* ; and Zītānesh, in the clan of *Bnī Jāfin*.

XII) *Bni Ḥmid s-Surrāq - total 1 :* Mzīnesh, in the clan of *Bnī Lāwa*.

If the frequency distribution of these names is any indication, the northwestern Jbāla would have been the most Latinized area in Northern Morocco, and a transition from Latin to Arabic may, if it did indeed occur there, have happened more easily and rapidly than that of Berber to Arabic elsewhere. Ghmāra, on the other hand, seems to have been hardly affected at all (which would tie in neatly with Caro Baroja's postulate that the linguistic Arabization of Ghmāra is a relatively modern phenomenon) ; and it is tempting to follow Colin's hypothesis of a western infiltration from the Jbāla proper to explain the existence of the name Jnānesh in Bnī Būzra, the most Berber tribe (if one uses speech as a criterion of judgment) in the Ghmāra group. It goes without saying, of course, that the phenomenon of lineage or village names ending in *-esh* is absolutely nonexistent in the Ṣanhāja Srīr and in the Rīf, both of which Colin considers « less complicated » areas than the Jbāla.

The sum total of available historical data on the Arabization of our area, then, is that in the northern mountain sector, with the probable exception of Ghmāra (my inclination in this instance is to favor Caro Baroja's view over that of Colin), this occurred earlier than elsewhere, with the establishment of cities and the persecution of shurfā who took refuge in the area both playing a considerable role ; that the possibility (admittedly extremely vague) of an earlier Latinization of the northwesternmost part of the region may have made the linguistic shift easier of accomplishment there than elsewhere; and that the area as a whole (with, again, the probable exception of Ghmāra) served as a zone of contact between North Africa and Muslim Spain, a fact which would in itself imply an early Arabization. The factors all help to explain why the Jbāla is an exception to the rest of Morocco : a mountain area in which Berber has disappeared.

We are still, however, faced with the problem of pinpointing this Arabization in time in a satisfactory manner, and beyond saying that it began somewhere between the end of the 7th century and was completed by the end of the 11th, this as yet we cannot do. We are as much in the dark, too, on the Arabization of the Ghmāra, although there is every reason to believe that this occurred much later than in the Jbāla. The abundant number of lineage and place names in the Ghmāra, a far higher figure — as the statistics will reveal — than in the Jbāla, supports Mármol's observation that the Ghmāra was still largely Berber in the 16th century. And Caro Baroja's view regarding the relative recentness of the Arabization process in Ghmāra on a linguistic level (16th-18th centuries) is also borne out by the fact that the tribe of Bnī Būzra, and the clan of Bnī ᶜArūs in the tribe of Bnī Manṣūr, still speak Berber to this day.

The occurence of an *-esh* name in the tribe of l-Gharbīya, however, might lead us to imagine that such names may once have existed in the northern tongue of the Atlantic Coastal Plain as well as in the northwestern Jbāla (where their primary center was the tribe closest of all to Spain, Anjra, with a large secondary outcropping in Bnī Yīdir, a group which Colin missed entirely) ; and that in the former area they may, well have been replaced by names provided by incoming Bedouins like the Khlūṭ. In any event, their distribution seems to be roughly coextensive with the area of the greatest amount of Roman strength and colonization in northern Morocco ; and that the further south and east one proceeds, the less frequent village names of this type become — it is highly doubtful if the Ghmāra proper was ever « Latinized », and certainly the Ṣanhāja Srīr and the Rīf never were.

However, the present state of our knowledge of these problems is such that any but the most tentative conclusions would be hopelessly premature.

— III —

The second of our three considerations is present-day linguistic distribution. In this connection, two things must be said at the outset : 1) that the purely Bedouin tribe of Ūlād Stūt, an intrusive group on the west or Rīfian bank of the Mulwīya River, has been grouped with the tribes of the Atlantic Coastal (also purely Bedouin) for the purposes of statistical analysis, and that in this respect it is completely in harmony with them ; and 2) that although the tribes of the Ṣanhāja Srīr, the Western or Modified Rīf, and the Rīfians Proper are all excluded from the more detailed aspects (especially statistical) of this survey, some reference to them cannot be avoided ; and they will be all assessed statistically *as groups* in Section VII, after the tribe-by-tribe analysis of Jbāla, Habṭ and Ghmāra.

The problem of speech distribution in Northern Morocco is one of *who* still speaks Berber and *who* has shifted to Arabic. In the quite small total area of the North Zone, we find that no less than four Berber dialects are spoken, e.g. :

I) *Shilḥa Būzrātīya :* on the Ghmāra coast. Spoken by (a) the tribe of Bnī Būzra (except for the clan of Tandāmān), whence the name, (b) the clan of Bnī ᶜArūs of the tribe of Bnī Manṣūr, and (c) the village of Igūnān in clan Bnī Siddrāt in the tribe Bnī Smiḥ ([22]). It is supposed to have vaguely traditional affiliations with the Tashilḥait dialect of the Sūs and Western High and Anti-Atlases, but such connections appear highly tenuous at best ; its speakers apparently say that Rīfian is easier for them to understand.

II) *Shilḥa Taghzūtīya :* spoken in two tribes of the Ṣanhāja Srīr : (a) in almost all of Taghzūt, and (b), in the clan of ᶜAbd l-Ghāya of the tribe of Ktāma, which adjoins Taghzūt. Here again, affiliations are supposed to be « Sūsī » ; the dialect is considered to be different from that of the Ṣan-

(22) (a) and (b) established by investigations of Colin, *op. cit.*, 1929. (c) established by Caro Baroja, *op. cit.*, 1957, p. 146, who also notes that Tandāmān of Bnī Būzra is now Arabic-speaking ; the implication is that the shift in speech has occurred since the publication of Colin's material.

Another point : the clan name Bnī Siddrāt goes suggest a possible southern origin, in conformity with some of the varying Ghmāran traditions, but from the Drāᶜ rather than the Sūs.

hāja Srīr Proper (23), as well as from Shilḥa Būzrātīya and from Rīfian. The remaining few villages of Taghzūt and the other four clans of Ktāma speak Arabic.

III) *Ṣanhāja Srīr* : spoken in most of the « true » Ṣanhāja Srīr tribes (24) of (a) Aith (or Bnī (25) Saddāt, (b) Aith Khannūs, (c) Aith Ḥmid, (d) Aith Bū Nṣar, (e) Zarqāt and (f) Aith Bshīr, as well as in three villages of (g) Bnī Gmīl and in about half the villages of (h) Aith Mazdūyī. In almost all the above tribes some villages speak Ṣanhājan, others Arabic (for example, the whole tribe of Bnī Bū Shībt, which the Ṣanhājans consider as one of themselves, is Arabic-speaking), in varying proportions, and the same applies to Taghzūt and Ktāma (Shilḥa Taghzūtīya) mentioned above.

(In connection with the Ṣanhāja Srīr, a word should be said about the concept of « bilingualism », one which can often be misleading. It would be difficult, I imagine, to find an adult Ṣanhājan male who does not speak at least some Arabic, and it seems hardly necessary to point out that Arabic is not only the language of religion, but of commerce ; and it would probably be equally difficult to find a Ṣanhājan female who does speak Arabic — for the language of the hearth and home is

(23) Marvin Mikesell, in a linguistic map of the area to be published soon in a revision of his Ph.D. dissertation, for the University of California, on the cultural geography of Northern Morocco, does not differentiate between the Taghzūtīya dialect and that of the Ṣanhāja Srīr Proper, but lumps them together.

(24) My enumeration of the Ṣanhāja Srīr tribes is based on Mikesell (personnal communication, 1958), who lists the following : a) Aith Saddāth, b) Ktāma, c) Taghzūt, d) Aith Khannūs, e) Aith Ḥmid, f) Aith Bū Nṣar, g) Zarqāt, h) Aith Bshīr, and i) Bnī Bū Sbībt. (As Mikesell spent a year or more doing fieldwork in the Ṣanhāja Srīr, he should know, and I take his word. He does not consider either Targīst or Aith Mazdūyī to be Ṣanhājan, and indeed includes the latter with the Rīfians Here I have some reservations : Aith Mazdūyī is certainly a mixture of Ṣanhājan and Rīfian elements, but which of these is the basic one I do not know. And Targīst is certainly another problem in classification. It contains one village, Aith ᶜAzza, which still speaks Rifian and is a spill-over from the clan of Aith Ḥadīfa in the neighboring tribe of Aith Waryāghar. But I suspect that the Rīfian elements are recent in time. Politically, as the seat of the shurfa Ikhamrijen, who controlled virtually the whole of the Ṣanhāja Srīr in pre-Spanish times, it is completely Ṣanhājan. I tentatively include it with the other dubious tribal groups of what I call the Western or « Modified » Rīf (Bnī Gmīl and its offshoot Mistāsa, Targīst, Aith Mazdūyī, Bnī Bū Frāḥ and Aith Yiṭṭuft), tribes which are neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring.)

(25) As Berber speech tends to predominate over Arabic in at least half the tribes, I refer to them as *Aith X* rather than *Bnī X*, thereby giving them « the benefit of the doubt » ; and I shall follow the same procedure in dealing with other tribes (except for the Ghmāran ones) where such is the case, save in the actual statistics — see note 62.

It might be stated here in passing that some of these tribes are too small to have more than one clan or maximal segment, which is coterminous, of course, with the tribe itself.

compartmentalized and distinct from each other ; and bilingualism on a tribal level, therefore, does not really exist, *except* insofar as some villages or clans — and *not* others — may have given up Berber entirely, as the result of various pressures.)

IV) *Rīfian :* spoken, among tribes in the area of Arabic-Berber speech contact, in : (a) the village of Aith ᶜAzza in the tribe of Targīst; (b) those villages in the tribe of Aith Mazdūyī which do not speak Ṣanhājan; (c) the village or lineage of Ihārūnen (26) in the clan of Ibūyīḥyāten, and that of Igzinnāyen (27) in the clan of Agnī, in the tribe of Bnī (or Aith) Bū Frāḥ, the rest of which speaks Arabic only; (d) the clan of Tūfīst (28) (with its subclans of Aith ᶜAisā and Izarwāṛen) in the tribe of Bnī (or Aith) Yiṭṭūft; and (e) all the Rīfian tribes proper (29) (beside which groups a, b, c and d above may be considered « Modified Rīf » only) — those of Ibuqqūyen, Aith ᶜAmmarth, Aith Waryāghaṛ, Igzinnāyen, Asht Tūzīn, Thafarsīth, Thimsāmān, Aith Wuṛtshik, Aith Saᶜīd, Ibdhāṛsen, Aith Bū Yiḥyī, the

(26) Descended from the lineage of Ihārūnen in the clan of Aith Ḥadhīfa in the Rīfian tribe of Aith Waryāghaṛ.

(27) Descended from the Rīfian tribe of Igzinnāyen ; there is also a village bearing this name in the essentially Rīfian-descended, though thoroughly composite, tribe of l-Faḥṣ in Tangier.

(28) Descended from the lineage of Ūfīs in the clan of Ijaᶜūnen in the Rīfian tribe of Aith ᶜAmmarth.

(29) The traditional breakdown of Rīfian into two subdialects, western and eastern, as originally proposed by Pedro SARRIONANDIA, O.F.M. (*Gramática de la Lengua Rifeña*, 2nd Ed., Tangier, 1925) and echoed by Esteban IBAÑEZ, O.F.M. (*Diccionario Español-Rifeño*, Madrid, 1944) I do not find entirely satisfactory, because is does not take into account certain essential sound shifts in the Central (or « Nuclear ») Rīfian area. José EROLA (*Distribución Lingüística del Dialecto Rifeño*, mss., 1952) has proposed a more viable scheme, but even it needs some refining. My own tentative classification, based mainly on the tribal distribution in the central area of such shifts as Arabic or Berber *ll* to Western ond West Central Rīfian *dd* to Central and Eastern Rīfian *ddj* ; « Western » Rīfian *-ag-* to « Eastern » *-ai-* ; « Western » Rīfian *-aith* to « Eastern » Rīfian *-ashth* ; and « Western » Rīfian *-rt* (from usual Berber *-lt*) to « Eastern » *-tsh*, is as follows : 1) *Western, Transitional or Modified* (Rīfian parts of Targīst, Bnī Bū Frāḥ, Bnī Yṭṭūft and Aith Mazdūyī) ; 2) *West-Central* (Ibuqqūyen, most of Aith ᶜAmmarth and the Uṭā and Uupper Ghīs areas of Aith Waryāghaṛ) ; 3) *Central Highland* (rest of Aith ᶜAmmarth — clan of Aith ᶜAbbū — and the Nakūr area of Aith Wariyāghaṛ, which is both the ethnic and linguistic keypoint of the whole area, in my opinion, buttressed by the adjacent clans of Igzinnāyen and Asht Tūzīn respectively) ; 4) *Southeast Central* (Igzinnāyen and Asht Tūzīn); 5) *East Central* (Thimsāmān) ; 6) *Eastern Proper* (Aith Saᶜīd, Aith Wuṛīshik, and Thafarsīth) ; 7) *Steppe* (Ibdhāṛsen and Aith Bū Yiḥyī) ; and 8) *Melilla-Mulwiya* (Iqaṛᶜāyen, Ikibdhānen and Aith Iznāsen).

five tribes of Iqarʿāyen (Aith Sīdāṛ, Aith Shīkār, Aith Bū Ifrūr, Aith Bū Gāfar and Imazūjen), Ikibdhānen and Aith Iznāsen (30).

Arabic is, of course, spoken everywhere else in the area. There are, however, essentially three dialects or subdialects of Arabic involved : 1) that of the northern Jbāla, or Jbāla proper, and Ghmāra areas, Colin's « northern mountain speakers », which includes the tribes of l-Faḥṣ (those in the Tangier Province being linguistically Jbālan today, but largely Rīfian in origin, its ascendants for the most part having been members of the Rīfian garrison which Mulay Ismāʿīl brought to Tangier in 1684 to repopulate the city after the British sacked and evacuated it ; the tribal name means « environs », and suggests the group's composite origins, referring as it does to the « environs » of Tangier (31)), Anjra, l-Ḥauz, Wadrās (32), Bnī Mṣawwar (33), Jbil Ḥbīb, Bnī Ḥuzmar, Bnī Ḥassān (34), Bnī Lāyit, Bnī Saʿīd (35), Bnī Yīdir, Bnī Gurfāṭ, Bnī ʿArūs (36), Sumāta, Ahl Srīf, Bnī Yīsif, Bnī Zakkār, l-Khmās l-ʿĀlī, l-Khmās s-Siflī (37), Ghzā-

(30) There have long been doubts as to how to classify the tribe of Aith Iznāsen, whether with Rīfian proper or as a separate but closely related dialect. The Spaniards, e.g., Sarrionandia (*op. cit.*, 1925) and Ibañez (*op. cit.*, 1944) take the former position while the French, e.g., E. Laoust (« Le Dialecte berbère du Rif », *Hespéris*, 1927, pp. 174-208) and A. Renisio (*Etudes sur les dialectes berbères du Beni Iznassen, du Rif et du Senhaja Serair*, Paris, 1932), take the latter. Upon cursory examination, I find that one of the few significant differences between the two dialects is that the *l* to *r* shift, so common in Rīfian proper, does not occur in Aith Iznāsen — but neither does it, apparently, in Ikibdhānen, which is considered Rīfian. Both of these tribes are said to have a common origin, from a place in Algeria called « Gārṭ » (cf. Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Salām al-Bū ʿAyāshī, *Al-Rīf baʿd al-Fatḥ al-Islāmī*, Tetuan, 1954). In addition, Rīfians from many of the « proper » Rīf tribes who know them have told me that they have absolutely no difficulty whatever in understanding the speech of men from Aith Iznāsen ; when I inquired about the dialect of the latter *vis-à-vis* their own, I was invariably given the answer « *kīf-kīf* » ! I thus tentatively back the Spanish position and include Aith Iznāsen with the Rīfian group, for the sake of classificatory (I use the word here in its ordinary, not in its anthropological, sense) simplicity if for no other reason — but I reiterate that this conclusion is purely provisional.

(31) For a discussion of the Faḥṣ, see David M. Hart, « Notes on the Rifian Community of Tangier », *The Middle East Journal*, vol. XI, no. 2, 1957, pp. 153-162.

(32) There are differences of opinion on the etymology of this tribal name. The Muslim historian al-Bakrī argues for the obvious Arabic etymology of *Wādī Rās* or *Nahr Rās*, « river of the head » (G.S. Colin, personal Communication, March 13, 1960), while S. Biarnay (« Un cas de regression vers le Droit coutumier berbère dans une tribu arabisée », *Archives Marocaines*, 1915) thinks it derives from a Berber tribal name *Idrāsen*.

(3) « Sons of the Maker of Pictures » This is incredibly far-fetched, but I neither know nor can think of any etymology which appears any more plausible.

(34) « Sons of the Barber » ?

(35) This tribe has no connection whatsoever with the Rīfian tribe of Aith Saʿīd, despite a very heavy Berber influence, far greater than that among any of its Jbālan neighbors, in clan and lineage names and despite the fact that at least part of this influence is unmistakeably Rīfian.

(36) « Sons of the Bridegroom » ?

(37) « Upper » and « Lower » l-Khmās, despectively, *l-khmās* itself (pl. of *l-khums*) meaning literally « fifths » and figuratively, « clans ».

wa, Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq (38), and the nine Ghmāran tribes (all of seven of them and a large part of Bnī Manṣūr and a small one of Bnī Būzra) : Bnī Manṣūr, Bnī Silmān, Bnī Khālid, Bnī Zjil, Bnī Ziyāt, Bnī Būzra, Bnī Grīr, Bnī Smīḥ and Bnī Rzīn (39) ; 2) that of the Western, Transitional or Modified Rīf (including, provisionally, the tribes of Mtīwa, Bnī Gmīl-Mistāsa, Bnī Bū Frāḥ, Bnī Yiṭṭūft and Targīst) ; and 3) that of the descendants of Arabian Bedouins : the tribes of l-Gharbīya, Mzūra-Bdāwa, Bdūr, ᶜĀmar, Sāḥil sh-Shimālī, Sāḥil l-Junūbī and Khlūṭ in the western Atlantic coastal plain, and the Ūlād Stūt tribe on the west bank of the Mulwīya and intrusive in the Eastern Rīf, in the east. This last dialect is, of course, an importation resulting from the migrations of the Banū Hilāl — and later, of the Maᶜqīl — across North Africa.

I reiterate that only these Bedouin groups, the Jbāla and the Ghmāra will be considered in detail in the following pages.

— IV —

We may now proceed to a few general comments on the nature of the tribal, clan and village and/or lineage names themselves, in the area under consideration, and on certain problems which underly them. The first of these problems is a denotative one.

Given the fact that every North African tribe (40) is genealogically structured, either naturally or forcibly, i.e., irrespective of whether or not its members all claim a common descent from the same ancestor ; and given the further fact that these members always conceive of themselves as « the sons of X » or « the children of X » or « the people of X »,

(38) « Sons of Ḥmid, the thieves » : considered to be descended from Aith Ḥmid of the Ṣanhāja Srīr, although there are no clan or lineage names linking it to the latter tribe.

(39) The Jbālan tribes are of extremely heterogeneous origin, and the very name « Jbāla » suggests a kind of ethnic catch-all ; one tradition of the Ghmāran tribes, however, is that they are all considered to be descended from the nine sons of a Fqih Aghmīr, whose names are in the order listed above (Caro Baroja, *op. cit.*, p. 141). *Aghmīr*, in Rīfian, means « limit, boundary » ; but from this name is probably derived that of Ghmāra.

(40) I have unfortunately not had an opportunity to see or check Jacques Berque, « Qu'est-ce qu'une tribu nord-africaine ? », *Hommage à Lucien Fèbvre, Eventail de l'Histoire vivante*, t. I, Paris 1953, pp. 261-75.

whether they actually are or not, in their external relationships with their neighbors and the outside world, we are at once confronted with a problem in semantics.

Most French investigators of the subject have either thought or assumed that, as tribal or clan designations, the Berber form *Ait X* and the Arabic forms *Bnī X* and *Ūlād X* all mean the same thing, « sons of X » ; this, tacitly or explicitly, seems to have been the majority opinion.

My own researches, however, have led me to the conclusion that this is not the case at all, even though the terms in question are often *used* indiscriminately. In Arabic, *bnī* and *ūlād* both *do* mean essentially the same thing : the former, « sons (of) », and the latter, « children (male) (of) » ; but Berber *ait* (and all its variant forms, *aith* and *asht* in the Rīf, *at* and *ath* in Kabylia, and *id*, *ida* and *idaw* in the Sūs) has as its proper opposite number in Arabic neither of the above, but rather the word *ahl*, « people (of) ». In the Arabic *bnī* and *ūlād* (whose Rīfian cognate, at least, is not *aith* at all, but *tharwa*, « sons », pl. of *mimmi*, and is, in context, employed as ***Tharwa n X*** or ***Tharwa w X***, according to what letter X's name begins with, for purposes of alliteration), the idea of kinship and/or descent is unmistakeably conveyed, whereas in Berber *ait* such is not always the case, and the orientation may be somewhat different. By this I do not mean at all the rather Victorian notion expressed by Georges Marcy of a hypothetical Berber matriliny in ancient times (41), a theory which I do not endorse. I mean rather that the implication in the Berber instance is that kinship is not necessarily the overriding consideration, as it plays a dyadic role with mountain ecology in vying for the position of primary factor among the criteria for group membership.

(41) Marcy has claimed in several articles that the Berber kinship term *ūma*, pl. *aitma*, « brother », ultimately means « son of the mother » — e.g., *ū-ma*, pl. *ait-ma* — and is hence a linguistic residue of a former matrilineal condition. See especially his article « Les vestiges de la parenté maternelle en Droit coutumier berbère et le régime de succession touarègue », *Revue africaine*, 3e-4e trimestre, 1941, pp. 187 sq. In my view, the principal objections to this theory are the following : 1) Stéphane Gsell in his *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* has shown fairly conclusively that Berbers have been patrilineal as far back as recorded history takes them ; 2) the classificatory meaning of the term *aitma* is « agnates », a fact which my Rīfian interpreter was quick to point out and one which Marcy does not mention ; and 3) just because the Tuareg are matrilineal (and recent research among them has cast some doubt even on this), must we therefore assume that all other Berber speakers once were ?... However, according to Lionel Galand (personal communication, November 17, 1960) Marcy's theory despite all other doubts one may have about it, seems to be completely correct on linguistic grounds.

This, I think, if I am not reading too much into it, makes good sense, in view of the fact that, *in general*, the notion of descent from a common patrilineal ancestor *at the tribal level* is more widespread among Arab tribes (especially among Bedouins) than it is among Berber ones, at least Berber ones who are sedentary agriculturists (42). In Northern Morocco, in any case, Arabo-Berbers and pure Berbers alike both tend to show the phenomenon of common patrilineal descent only at lower levels of segmentation : clans or primary segments, subclans or subsegments, and villages or hamlets (which may or may not be coextensive with larger lineage branches in the segmentation process) ; and even here the territorial factor may often be as strong in determining group composition as the genealogical principle. To illustrate : a Bedouin Arab can generally count back through 20 or 25 generations of patrilineal ascendants, on a step-by-step basis, with the sequence immutably fixed in his own mind regardless of whether he may actually skip a century or more in the process (43) ; while a Berber, or at least a Rīfian, can seldom go beyond his patrilineal great-grandfather or great-great-grandfather, and 7 or 8 generations is the absolute maximum. (Whether or not this reveals a greater degree of genealogical « honesty » among Berbers, by Western standards, or rather, a lesser opportunity to « cook the genealogical books » —particularly tempting for lineages aspiring to descent from the Prophet—, is quite beside the point.) Also, among Berbers, naturalization of individuals or even groups from other clans or other tribes, people who have had to leave or flee from their own tribes because of bloodfeuds or dispossession, is extremely common; and this, too, reinforces the notion of *Aith X* as « *people of X* », because bonds of common interest and allegiance are forged which may eventually become as strong as those of kin, and which are, indeed, cemented by the latter through marriage.

(42) I appreciate, nonetheless, the difficulties of trying to generalize about this problem. Any rule has its exceptions ; in this case, they are constituted by a number of Berber tribes in the Central and Eastern High Atlas, whose members *do* claim descent from a single ancestor. Ait Sukhmān and Ait ᶜAṭṭa are both good examples. These tribes, however, are not sedentary agriculturists, but transhumants ; and the temptation to draw an analogy here is a strong one.

(43) Cf. an interesting work by Miguel Molina Campuzano, *Contribución al Estudio del Censo en el Sáhara Español*, Madrid, 1954, which advocates an adoption of the « genealogical method » as the surest and primary basis for obtaining correct census data in Bedouin camps. I myself have found the method to be just as efficacious, for the same purpose, in Rīfian hamlets.

Thus, among the Berbers and Arabo-Berbers of the Moroccan North, the X of Aith X may denote a geographical area or a certain kind of land just as often as it may a village, lineage or clan ancestor. It is true that if any of the inhabitants of our area consider themselves descended from a single person, they will often include the name of the locale in the same breath by saying, « In this village of Y, we are all the sons of X ». If this is not the case, however, and if their origins are heterogeneous, the function of such a place name is almost, as it were, to create the *illusion* of common descent through toponymical and topographical amalgamation. And Caro Baroja makes the telling observation that although the term *qabīla* is used both among Bedouins and among Berbers (generally, in the latter instance, in a Berberized form : *taqbīlt* in the Atlas, and *thaqbīt* or *thaqbītsh* in the Rīf) to denote a « tribe », the *qabīla*-concept is a very different thing in the desert from what it is in the mountains (44). Most of the clues to these differences are provided by topography and ecology, and the vast divergence in basic economy between camel nomads and sedentary farmers. Tribal boundaries in the desert, for instance, undergo gradual but continual shifts, while the heartland of any Bedouin tribe is its wells ; in the mountains, however, boundaries are established more often according to natural features (watersheds, rivers, arroyos, gorges, ravines, etc.), and tend, by comparison, to remain constant. It is for these reasons that I visualize the concept of the *qabīla* in Northern Morocco as an adaptation (and indeed a transfiguration) of the original Bedouin notion to a mountain environment.

And, these structural considerations aside, let us remember that the Jbāla and Ghmāra tribesmen of Northwest Morocco, although they speak

(44) Caro Baroja, *op. cit.*, 1957, pp. 128, 146, who says (p. 146), developing this notion further, that the idea of the lineage with respect to the tribe is also quite different in the Ghmāra from what it is among the Bedouins of the Spanish Sahara (as, indeed, it should be, logically) :

« En la montaña la qabīla es una unidad geográfica claramente definida con ciertos rasgos económicos y administrativos que algunos escritores antiguos ya procuraron destacar, mientras en el Sáhara es una unidad social basa la fundamentalmente en la existencia de unos linajes, largos por lo general, emparentados entre sí. Claro es que no hay que exagerar la importancia que tales hechos pueden tener desde el punto de vista de la fuerza coercitiva de un tipo de qabīla y otro, pues *la densidad de población está en relación inversa con la densidad del sistema de linajes* » (my italics, p. 146).

It may be of interest to note here that while the population density of the South Zone of Morocco is some 14-15 people per sq. km., that of the North Zone is 50 people per sq. km. Although this only raises the national average up to 15-16 people per sq. km., however, the North Zone figure gives added weight to Caro Baroja's observation (cf. Antonio Bermejo de la Rica, *Marruecos : Síntesis Geográfica*, Madrid, 1950, p. 72).

Arabic, are essentially Berber otherwise, both institutionally and organizationally. The proof of the pudding, perhaps, lies in the fact they themselves refer to the inhabitants of the Gharb and the Atlantic Coastal Plain as *ʿArab*.

Two words of caution, however. The first is that all names are subject to change through time, even though those of larger units (tribes and even clans) have a remarkable staying power. The question of time depth *vis-à-vis* lineage depth is ultimately one of process, and to this end, the reference to Mikesell's concept at the beginning of this essay serves a wider purpose, by providing a continuum. The second is that the similarity of Arabic and/or Berber toponyms over widely different parts of Morocco (or, indeed, North Africa) may often serve more as a pitfall for the unwary investigator than as a source of clues ; for the possible connections suggested by two identical names in different areas often prove misleading or false, and it is thus usually wiser to treat the occurrence as fortuitous. At best, such occurrences lend themselves only to possible lines of inquiry *within* the framework of tribal and kin mythology, which in turn should be taken at its face value only if, when and how it sheds light on the tribal self-image, value system and social structure.

We are now in a position, I think, to look at some of the names themselves, and at whatever rules, linguistic, genealogical or topographical, may govern them. It is all very well to say (as I have said) that *ait* is Berber and *bnī* and *ūlād* are Arabic, but without further elaboration, this becomes a way of approaching the problem which is at once simplistic, question-begging and tautological. There are at least two additional matters to be considered in this connection. The first, and most obvious, is that not all Berber names of lineages, segments or clans begin, in Northern Morocco, with *Ait*. They are often merely a Berberized and pluralized version of *Bnī X* or *Ūlād X*, resulting, generally, in *I—X—n* ; thus *Bnī Fūlān* or *Ūlād Fūlān* (the Arabic equivalent of « so-and-so », whence the Spanish *fulano* or, in context, *Fulano de Tal*, is derived), considered purely hypothetically, *may* become *Ifūlānen* or *Ifṛānen* (both of which are hypothetical Rifian constructs) as easily as *Ait Fūlān* or *Tharwa n Fṛān*. For example, *Ūlād Ṭāhir* might become *Iṭāhīṛen* (an actual example from

the clan of Qāᶜasrās in the Ghmāran tribe of Bnī Ziyāt) and *Bnī ᶜAbd Allāh* might become *Iᶜabdallāten* (another actual example, from the clan of Agnūrī in the Jbālan tribe of Bnī Saᶜīd); while *Ūlād l-ᶜArab* might become *Iᶜarāben* (examples of this particular name, « Arabs », are extremely common in the region and are, no doubt, a fairly conclusive testimony to the fact that the group in question is not Arab at all, but Berber; the one I have chosen, purely at random, comes from the clan of l-Wisṭīyīn in the Ghmāran tribe of Bnī Būzra, which just happens to be the *most* Berber of the Ghmāra groups); *Bnī Mūsā* might become *Imūsāten* (clan of Bnī Murrāq in the Ghmāran tribe of Bnī Rzīn); *Ūlād l-Ḥajjām* (« sons of the barber ») might become *Iḥajjāmen* (same clan, same tribe, as the preceding); and *Ūlād Ḥaddūsh*, to take a lineage with a distinctly Berber ancestral name, might become *Iḥaddūshen* (clan of Izimmūren, in the mixed Ghmāran-Transitional or Modified Rīfian tribe of Mtīwa dyāl Bḥar). Examples could be multiplied *ad nauseam*, but the point should be clear by now, if, indeed, I have not already belabored it too heavily : that this aspect of the Berberization process (a process may, after all, work both ways) is invoked when it is so warranted by the name, nickname, patronymic (45) or profession of the lineage or clan ancestor.

The second consideration, which heretofore has not been squarely confronted, is that of clan and hamlet/village and/or lineage names which reflect a topographical feature or a geographical area rather than a common ancestor. It is, of course, impossible to deduce from such a name itself the degree of homogeneity or heterogeneity of the social grouping it represents or whose members (if it is a toponym) live in it. And, indeed, such names, usually referring to a particular kind of land, and associated with the clan or lineage in question either by its own members and/or by

(45) Although, as in most patrilineal societies, patronymics are very much the rule, very exceptional examples of matronymics do occur, in both nickname form (clan of *Bnī Bizzāz*, « sons of the breasts », in the Jbālan tribe of Bnī Saᶜīd, and *Ibizzāzen*, same meaning, I imagine, in the clan of Shwāḥil in the Ṣanhāja Srīr tribe of Bnī Bū Shibt) and in real name form (*Ūlād Maryim*, clan of Ūlād Brāhīm bin ᶜAlī, Eastern Rīfian tribe of Ibdhārṣen (Mṭālsa), and clan of *Ūlād Faṭṭūma* in Eastern Rīfian tribe of Aïth Bū Yiḥyī — true matronymics seem commoner among the Eastern Rīfian seminomads than elsewhere). Matronymy, however, is usually explained through other causes : early death of the father, or polygyny in which at least one wife is from another tribe and is referred to by the feminine form of her tribal name, etc.

outsiders, are generally very difficult to translate, although these are, of course, exceptions — I myself have often found when questioning the etymology of such and such a hamlet name in the Rīf that it is « just the name of that piece of land — *ṣāfī baraka !* » (It goes without saying that an answer shrugged off in this manner can sometimes be the despair of a researcher !) Although I have not personally worked in either the Jbāla or the Ghmāra, I have passed through both of them by car and bus many times, and I infer, after reading Julio Caro Baroja's perceptive paper on the latter area, that the same type of answer would be forthcoming in these regions as well (46).

This paper is not intended to be a glossary of North Moroccan toponymy, and there is thus no need here to give detailed examples of clan and village or hamlet names reflecting places or topographical features which *do l*end themselves to translation. Their meanings would be obvious to any student of Arabic or Berber (e.g., to pick a Berber one at random, *Tāla Mqqrān,* « big spring », in the clan Yaggūn of the tribe of Mtīwa dyāl Bḥar ; or another, more famous one, *Tazrūt,* « little rock », in the clan of l-Mdāshir in the Jbālan tribe of Bnī ʿArūs, the former home of Mūlāy Aḥmad al-Raisūlī). My orientation here is not toward etymology for its own sake, but rather toward the frequency of occurrence, statistically expressed, of toponyms as opposed to names of lineages, clans and tribes, and, transversely, of Berber names as opposed to Arabic ones, over the often tortuous and always rugged and craggy countryside of Northwest Morocco as a whole.

To this end, all of the foregoing may be considered as a combined historical and functional introduction : « historical » from what the primary Arabic sources can give us and « functional » in terms of what we can determine, inductively and deductively, from the present-day ecological, social and toponymical structures of the tribes themselves.

If, as is not only highly probable but almost certain, the vestiges of Berber toponymy in the Jbāla, Ghmāra and Ṣanhāja Srīr areas not only

(46) Quoting Mármol, Caro Baroja also observes that in the former's day, some names which now have *only* a geographical connotation then had a tribal one, e.g., *Bnī Tīzīrān,* which is today just *Tīzīrān* and refers only to a mountain (*op. cit.*, p. 140).

reveal clues to differences in dialect from the Berber presently spoken in the Rīf proper, but also show signs of variation among themselves, I put forth, in my own behalf, an immediate disclaimer, and leave the matter in the hands of professional Berberists.

— V —

For purposes of statistical analysis, I am taking as both a point of reference and as a point of departure a slim pamphlet published under the auspices of the former Spanish High Commission in Morocco and entitled Alta Comisaría de España en Marruecos, *Nombres de los Musulmanes Habitantes en la Zona de Protectorado de España en Marruecos : Territorios, Kabilas, Fracciones y Poblados de la Misma*, Tetuán : Editora Marroquí, 1955 (47), as well as a slightly earlier version, in Arabic and undated, of the main body of the same work, comprising the tribal listings. As I have already implied earlier, the statistical material itself will therefore of necessity be restricted to the « North » (former Spanish) Zone of Morocco, as I do not have at hand relevant data for the Jbālan tribes on the southern side of the former Franco-Spanish protectoral frontier. Not only this, but the material will be further restricted to only the Jbālan, Habṭ (or Lukkūs) and Ghmāran tribes, although Ṣanhāja Srīr, Modified Rīf and Rīf Proper will all be given consideration as units in the final section, in order to provide a sounder basis of comparison.

The essential idea and method underlying this analysis is very simple. It involves, on three different levels (tribal, clan or segment, and village-hamlet or lineage) a two-way classification of all names according to whether they are *Arabic* (designated as A) or *Berber* (designated as B) ; and, cross-cutting this, another two-way classification according to whether they refer to *people* (designated as I) or to *places* (designated as II). Thus, IA indicates an Arabic personal name; IIA, an Arabic place name; IB, a Berber personal name; and IIB, a Berber place name.

(47) See footnote 21.

It should be stated here that Roman numeral I is employed in an overall ethnic sense rather than just in the narrow sense of denoting a descent group. It therefore implies not only patrilineal units descended from a putative common ancestor, but agglomerates which have incorporated client and other groups and which have thus maintained a fiction of common descent, as well. This applies to village or lineage, clan, and tribal names indiscriminately. Any other kind of name will, of course, automatically fall into the category of Roman numeral II, or toponyms.

A further note on the statistical key : « T.V. » refers to « Total Villages » (total number of villages or hamlets in each clan). The villages themselves have not been listed by name in this paper because of considerations of space, and because in any case my object is Arab-Berber frequency ratios rather than etymologies. I refer the interested reader, who wishes to check for himself, to my primary source, *Nombres de los Musulmanes ... etc.*, from which the statistics to follow have been drawn.

The following, thus, are four basic factors : A, B, I, II, followed by their four basic combinations : IA, IIA, IB, IIB. All further combinations or composite forms deriving from any or all of the above fall ultimately into one of them (48). It must be remembered, however, that all the statistical data have been processed from a single source, one reflecting a tribal segmentation which may or may not have been slightly modified by the Spaniards for administrative purposes, rather than one which is wholly autochthonous.

An example of this, which has perhaps greater structural than statistical relevance, is that, in my experience, the number of clans (which are called variously *nuṣṣ*, « half », *tulut*, « third », *rbaᶜ*, « fourth », or *khums*, « fifth », usually according to how many of them the tribe contains), in the Rīfian tribes et least, never exceeds five — though this rule of thumb may prove to hold true only for the Rīf itself. Indeed, in the Rīf Proper, five is the most common number. As none of

(48) Such as *Dar l-ᶜUqāl*, « the house of the brains » (in the clan of l-Barqūqīyīn in the Jbālan tribe of Anjra), which is based on *Dār* (IIA), plus *l-ᶜUqāl* (IA), and thus yields an immediate result of IIA+IA. It falls, however, into the IA category because the ultimate referent is persons rather than a place. The same applies to the clan of *Jāmiᶜ ṭ-Ṭulbā*, « the mosque of the students », in the Habṭ or Lukkūs tribe of l-Khlūṭ. Many examples of this type could be given, but these two will suffice. And, in any case, not only would a further breakdown result in a tautology, but it would render the data themselves more difficult to control.

the Rīfian tribes can trace its origins back to a single patrilineal ancestor (although in some instances their clans claim putative clan ancestors) ; as their tradition myths show, to the contrary, a considerable heterogeneity, even though such heterogeneity is essentially localized within the Rīf; and as, on the evidence of medieval Arabic sources, some of them date back at least a millennium within the general areas they now occupy — for these reasons, it is my opinion that in the Rīfian case, at least, the fact that we never find more than five clans is due to a conscious attempt, over time, to align unrelated groups together in a roughly symmetrical fashion (49), the tribe-to-tribe variation in number of clans being directly proportional to the population of the tribe as a whole ; for the bigger tribes have five clans, and the smaller ones have less.

It is, of course, possible that the fact that we find as many as eleven clans in the coastal Jbālan tribe of Bnī Saʿīd, and ten each in another Jbālan tribe, Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq, and in the Ghmāran tribe of Bnī Ziyāt, for instance, may indicate as many sons on the part of possible tribal genitors. The clan names themselves, however, in these and other cases, render this hypothesis dubious ; and it seems more likely that at least some of the clans represent increments from outside which have not been fully assimilated, from a nominal standpoint, into a wider system of clanship. Perhaps this is partly a function of topography and ecology. These are only conjectures on my part, but they point up the real need for intensive research in the Jbālan and Ghmāran areas.

This combination of factors may well represent a possible source of error in my statistics. Another source of error, equally possible, may stem from the fact that I have only one tribal listing, and no other, at my disposal; for it is seldom that two listings are exactly alike in all details, although they generally agree on the larger units. This fact, of course, depends in turn upon the ethnographer's informants and upon the degree of ambiguity between the statements of one man and those of the next, an ambiguity which may quite easily, in some instances, be inherent in the whole social organization of the tribe in question. That, however, is another matter.

(49) This type of clan formation and alignment should *not* be confused with the *liff* system of tribal and/or clan alliances, a phenomenon which, although it makes use of the segmentary system, is of quite a different order and does so for quite different ends.

Another perhaps even greater source of error is the fact that the listing gives only the names themselves for the investigator to go on, with no historical or traditional or even *ex post facto* explanations regarding their background ; and it is thus possible that some of the names listed on their face value *qua names* as « Arabic » or « Berber » may in fact, from the point of view of the communities they represent, well be the reverse. And last but by no means least are my own linguistic fallibility and limitations at such classification ; indeed, I feel sure that if some other researcher with more qualifications than I have were to undertake this task in the same (or in a different) way as I have done, the results might not only be quite different, but, no doubt, more accurate.

There is only one more point to be made here : that the names themselves are *relative*, and so is any classification, *ipso facto*, which is based upon them. Just as race, language and culture are apt to follow diverging paths and seldom to parallel each other except fortuitously, names and origins may show an analogous overall trend. Any attempt at a really rigorous classification in this regard is always vitiated by the lack of etymological, etc., knowledge of the people themselves. *Many* are the names which evoke only a question mark, and although it is admittedly « unscientific » to do so, I have felt constrained to « play these names by ear », after weighing all the possibilities — with the help of Rīfian (and hence, regarding Jbāla and Ghmāra, unbiased !) informants, and available dictionaries. No doubt my errors of judgment are numerous, and for them I take full responsibility; but I think that my effort is vindicated, because its overall conclusions very staunchly support such documentary and other evidence as already exists — and vice versa. The known facts of history are here given substantial statistical validation; and although my methodology has undeniable shortcomings (particularly with regard to data control) — and no one is more sensitive to them than I — I believe that the end result is a positive one.

— VI —

Statistics (see following pages).

JBĀLA

I) **Anjra** — name : IB

Clans - 3	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin plural ending
1) l-Barqūqīyīn (IA)	41	40	1	18	23	18	22	0	1	9
2) l-Ghābāwīyīn (IA)	36	33	3	8	28	7	26	1	2	3
3) l-Baḥrāwīyīn (IA)	32	30	2	18	14	18	12	0	2	5
										1 (in Tangier)
Clan names : 100 % IA	109	103	6	44	65	43	60	1	5	18
	%	94.49	5.51	40.37	59.63	39.45	55.04	0.91	4.60	16.49

II) **l-Ḥauz** — name : IIA

Clans - 2	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) s-Saddīnī (IA)	9	8	1	4	5	4	4	0	1
2) l-Baḥrī (IA)	15	15	0	5	10	5	10	0	0
Clan names : 100 % IA	24	23	1	9	15	9	14	0	1
	%	95.83	4.17	37.50	62.50	37.50	58.33	0.00	4.17

III) **Wadrās** — name : IIA or IB

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) l-Baggāra (IA)	20	19	1	4	16	3	16	1	0	0
2) Rbaᶜ l-Wisṭī (IIA)	13	11	2	8	5	7	4	1	1	2
3) Bū Mattāsh (IA)	13	13	0	5	8	5	8	0	0	2
4) ᶜAin l-Ṣṣāb (IIA)	6	6	0	2	4	2	4	0	0	2
Clan names : 50 % IA, 50 % IIA	52	49	3	19	33	17	32	2	1	6
	%	94.23	5.77	36.54	63.46	32.70	61.54	3.46	2.30	11.54

IV) **Bnī Mṣawwar** — name : IA

Clans - 2	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) l-Ḥā'iṭ l-Fūqī (IIA)	39	38	1	16	23	16	22	0	1	6
2) l-Ḥā'iṭ s-Siflī (IIA)	18	17	1	3	15	3	14	0	1	0
Clan names : 100 % IIA	57	55	2	19	38	19	36	0	2	6
	%	95.96	4.04	33.33	66.67	33.33	63.16	0.00	3.51	10.53

V) ***l-Faḥṣ Isbanī*** *(50)* — **name : IIA**

Clans - 2	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) ᶜĀmar (IA)	5	5	0	2	3	2	3	0	0
2) z-Zīnāt (IA)	7	7	0	3	4	3	4	0	0
Clan names : 100 % IA	12	12	0	5	7	5	7	0	0
	%	100.00	0.00	41.67	58.33	41.67	58.33	0.60	0.00

VI) **Jbil Ḥbīb** — **name : IIA**

Clans - 2	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) l-Ḥā'iṭ l-Fūqī (IIA)	13	11	2	6	7	5	6	1	1	2
2) l-Ḥā'iṭ s-Siflī (IIA)	18	16	2	3	15	2	15	1	1	1
Clan names : 100 % IIA	31	27	4	9	22	7	20	2	2	3
	%	87.10	12.90	29.03	70.97	22.58	64.52	6.45	6.45	9.68

(50) *Isbānī* or « Spanish » refers, of course to the name given the tribe by the Spanish protectorate administration prior to independence. The tribe will possibly be assimilated with the larger Faḥṣ of Tangier in the future (1960).

VII) **Bnī Yīdir** — name : IB

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) s-Sabtrīyīn (IA)	25	23	2	21	4	20	3	1	1	4
2) l-ᶜUnṣar (IIA)	16	16	0	10	6	10	6	0	0	1
3) Sailūla (IIA)	35	32	3	23	12	23	9	0	3	8
4) Bnī Ḥmāyid (IA)	8	7	1	0	8	0	7	0	1	0
Clan names : 50 % IA, 50 % IIA	84	68	6	54	30	53	25	1	5	13
	%	92.86	7.14	64.29	35.71	63.10	29.76	1.19	5.95	15.48

VIII) **Bnī Ḥuzmar** — name : IB

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) l-Wād (IIA)	7	5	2	5	2	4	1	1	1	1
2) l-Jbil (IIA)	7	4	3	3	4	2	2	1	2	0
3) Amtīl (IIB)	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
4) Bnī Maᶜdān (IA)	4	4	0	3	1	3	1	0	0	0
5) Bnī Rātin (IB)	3	3	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	1
Clan names : 20 % IA, 40 % IA, 20 % IB	24	16	8	12	12	10	6	2	6	2
	%	66.67	33.33	50.00	50.00	41.67	25.00	8.33	25.00	8.33

IX) **Bnī Ḥassān** — name : IA

Clans - 3	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī ʿAlī (IA)	9	4	5	7	2	4	0	3	2
2) l-Khums (IIA)	4	3	1	4	0	3	0	1	0
3) Bnī Mahrūn (IA)	7	4	3	0	7	0	4	0	3
Clan names : 66.67 % IA, 33.33 % IIA	20	11	9	11	9	7	4	4	5
	%	55.00	45.00	55.00	45.00	35.00	20.00	20.00	25.00

X) **Bnī Lāyit** — name : IA

Clans - 1	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Lāyit (IA)	6	2	4	1	5	0	2	1	3
	6	2	4	1	5	0	2	1	3
	%	33.33	66.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	33.33	16.67	50.00

XI) **Bnī Saʿīd** — name : IA

Clans - 11	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Possible Matronymic	
1) Azarzā (IIB)	7	1	6	4	3	0	1	4	2	0	
2) Msā (IIA)	5	1	4	3	2	0	1	3	1	0	
3) Bnī ʿĀṣim (IA)	4	1	3	2	2	0	1	2	1	0	
4) Agnūrī (IIB)	9	4	5	8	1	3	1	5	0	0	
5) Anāsil (IIB)	7	2	5	5	2	1	1	4	1	0	
6) Tanūdāt (IIB)	6	1	5	3	3	0	1	3	2	0	
7) Tighza (IIB)	7	1	6	4	3	0	1	4	2	0	
8) ʿAzīya (IA)	3	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	
9) Tizgā (IIB)	8	3	5	6	2	1	2	5	0	0	
10) Warrāq (IA)	12	2	10	7	5	1	1	6	4	0	
11) Bnī Bizzāz (IA - matronymic?)	14	3	11	7	7	1	2	6	5	1	(?)
Clan names : 36.46 % IA, 8.99 % IIA, 54.55 % IIB	82	20	62	50	32	7	13	43	19	1	(?)
	%	24.39	75.61	60.09	39.91	8.53	15.75	52.44	23.27	1.27	(?)

XII) Bnī Gurfaṭ — name : IB

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Shifrāwesh (IA+Latin ending)	3	3	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	2
2) Būhānī (IA)	3	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
3) s-Sakhra (IIA)	3	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0
4) l-Kīfān (IIA)	4	4	0	1	3	1	3	0	0	0
5) l-Khṭūṭ (IIA)	4	4	0	1	3	1	3	0	0	1
Clan names : 40 % IA (including 20 % IA+Latin ending), 60 % IIA	17	16	1	5	12	5	11	0	1	3
	%	94.12	5.88	29.41	70.59	29.41	64.71	0.00	5.88	17.65

XIII) **Bnī ʿArūs** — name : IA

Clans - 6	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Abyaṭ (IIA)	10	8	2	3	7	3	5	0	2	0
2) l-Mdāshir (IIA)	7	3	4	4	3	2	1	2	2	0
3) Bnī Wumrās (IB)	12	11	1	7	5	6	5	1	0	1
4) Urā ḍ-Dhār (IIA)	18	9	9	6	12	5	4	1	8	3
5) l-ʿAzzāba (IIA)	17	16	1	8	9	8	8	0	1	0
6) Yarkūd (IIA)	14	7	7	7	7	5	2	2	5	1
Clan names : 83.33 % IIA, 16.67 % IB	78	54	24	35	43	29	25	6	18	5
	%	69.23	30.77	46.16	53.84	37.18	32.05	7.68	23.09	6.41

XIV) **Sumāta** — name : IIA

Clans - 2	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Shnātfa Sīdī Mizwār (IB) ...	7	5	2	4	3	4	1	0	2
2) l-Ḥwīyāt (IIA)	8	4	4	2	6	2	2	0	4
Clan names : 50 % IIA, 50 % IB	15	9	6	6	9	6	3	0	6
	%	60.00	40.00	40.00	60.00	40.00	20.00	0.00	40.00

XV) **Ahl Srīf** — name : IA

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Marqad aḍ-Dbāb (IIA)	12	12	0	2	10	2	10	0	0
2) l-Jīblīya (IA)	14	13	1	7	7	6	7	1	0
3) l-Utāwīyīn (IIA)	12	11	1	4	8	3	8	1	0
4) Bnī Qūmāḥ (IA)	11	9	2	8	3	7	2	1	1
5) Bnī Idrīs (IA)	14	11	3	6	8	4	7	2	1
Clan names : 80 % IA, 20 % IIA	63	56	7	27	36	22	34	5	2
	%	88.89	11.11	42.86	57.14	34.92	53.97	7.94	3.17

XVI) **Bnī Yīsif** — name : IA

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Ḥaddādīn (IA)	11	8	3	1	10	1	7	0	3
2) Bnī Yiḥyā (IA)	5	3	2	2	3	2	1	0	2
3) Bnī ʿAbd Allāh (IA)	9	5	4	2	7	1	4	1	3
4) Zlāwīyīn (IA)	9	6	3	1	8	1	5	0	3
5) Bnī Bū Hādī (IA)	12	9	3	2	10	2	7	0	3
Clan names : 100 % IA	46	31	15	8	38	7	24	1	14
	%	67.39	32.61	17.40	82.60	15.22	52.17	2.18	30.43

XVII) **Bnī Zakkār** — name : IA

Clans - 1	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Zakkār (IA)	11	6	5	4	7	4	2	0	5
Clan names : 100 % IA	11	6	5	4	7	4	2	0	5
	%	54.55	45.45	36.36	63.64	36.36	18.19	0.00	45.45

XVIII a) **l-Khmās s-Siflī** — name : IA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Bnī Zarwīl (IB)	27	14	13	12	15	7	7	5	8	2
2) Bnī Jbāra (IA)	25	9	16	10	15	6	3	4	12	1
3) Bnī Jāfin (IB)	24	15	9	11	13	10	6	1	7	1
4) Bnī Tlīd (IA)	14	9	5	5	9	5	4	0	5	0
Clan names : 50 % IA, 50 % IB	90	47	43	38	52	28	20	10	32	4
	%	52.22	47.78	42.22	57.78	31.11	22.22	11.11	35.56	4.44

XVIII b) **l-Khmās l-ʿĀlī** — name : IA

Clans - 7	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Filwāt (IA)	10	5	5	2	8	0	5	2	3
2) Bnī Ṣāliḥ (IA)	12	7	5	3	9	3	4	0	5
3) Bnī Dirkūl (IA)	11	2	9	4	7	0	2	4	5
4) l-Khzāna (IIA)	7	5	2	3	4	3	2	0	2
5) Tangāya (IIB)	6	4	2	2	4	2	2	0	2
6) Tisūka (IIB)	4	2	2	1	3	1	1	0	2
7) l-Habṭīyīn (IA)	6	1	5	1	5	0	1	1	4
Clan names : 57.14 % IA, 14.31 % IIA, 28.57 % IIB	56	26	30	16	40	9	17	7	23
	%	46.07	53.93	28.59	71.41	16.07	30.36	12.50	41.07

XVIII Total) **l-Khmās** - Total — name : IA

Clans - 11	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
I) s-Siflī — 4	**90**	**47**	**43**	**38**	**52**	**28**	**20**	**10**	**32**	**4**
II) l-ᶜĀlī — 7	**56**	**26**	**30**	**16**	**40**	**9**	**17**	**7**	**23**	**0**
Total clan names : 63.64 % IA, 8.59 % IA, 8.59 % IB, 18.18 % IIB	**146**	**73**	**73**	**54**	**92**	**37**	**37**	**17**	**55**	**4**
	%	**50.00**	**50.00**	**38.33**	**61.67**	**25.34**	**25.34**	**11.65**	**37.67**	**4.44**

XIX) **Ghzāwa** — name : IA

Clans - 3	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Madrāsīn (IA)	**13**	**12**	**1**	**8**	**5**	**8**	**4**	**0**	**1**
2) Bnī Faghlūm (IA)	**8**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**2**
3) Bnī ᶜĀmar (IA)	**11**	**3**	**8**	**4**	**7**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**6**
Clan names : 100 % IA	**32**	**19**	**13**	**17**	**15**	**13**	**6**	**4**	**9**
	%	**59.37**	**41.63**	**56.50**	**43.50**	**40.62**	**18.75**	**12.50**	**28.13**

XX) **Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq** (52) — name : IA

Clans - 10	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Tāla n Dāwud (IB)	5	3	2	1	4	0	3	1	1	0
2) Bīmām (IIB)	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
3) Tāla Zimmūr (IIB)	6	3	3	1	5	1	2	0	3	0
4) Tafsa (IIB)	4	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	0
5) Ishtīwān (IB)	6	6	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
6) Adwār (IIA)	4	4	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
7) Tālīwān (IIB)	3	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	0
8) Kākat (IIB)	9	5	4	5	4	3	2	2	2	0
9) Bnī Mistra (IA)	9	6	3	5	4	3	3	2	1	0
10) Bnī Lāwa (IA)	12	7	5	4	8	4	3	0	5	1
Clan names : 20 % IA, 10% IIA, 20% IB, 50% IIB	61	39	22	29	32	21	18	6	16	1
	%	63.93	36.07	47.53	52.47	34.43	29.50	15.45	20.62	1.64

(51) This tribe is suposedly descended from the Bnī Ḥmid of the Sanhāja Srīr, or at least from a couple of its members who left their origial home, became thieves (hence the nickname *surrāq*) and moved west. The tribe contains no village or clan names showing any possible linkage with Bnī Ḥmid of the Sanhāja, however, although there is a village *s-Surrāq* in the clan of Adwār. From this, presumably the point of origin of the new group, the tribal nickname is no doubt derived.

LUKKŪS, HABṬ, OR NORTHERN GHARB (BEDOUINS)

I) **l-Gharbīya** — name : IA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Ūlād Khalūf (IA)	17	16	1	14	3	13	3	1	0	1
2) Ūlād Sbaita (IA)	13	13	0	7	1	7	6	0	0	0
3) Ūlād Ḥabbās (IA)	9	7	2	8	6	6	1	2	0	0
4) Ūlād ᶜArūs (IA)	12	10	2	5	7	3	7	2	0	0
Clan names : 100 % IA	51	46	5	34	17	29	17	5	0	1
	%	90.20	9.80	66.67	33.33	51.86	33.33	14.81	0.00	1.96

II) **Mzūra - Bdāwa** — name IB and IA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Mzūra - Bdāwa (IA-IA)	8	8	0	7	1	7	1	0	0
Clan names : 50 % IA, 50 % IB	8	8	0	7	1	7	1	0	0
	%	100.00	0.00	87.50	12.50	87.50	12.50	0.00	0.00

III) **Bdūr** — name : IIA

Clans - 1	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bdūr (IIA)	11	11	0	11	0	11	0	0	0
Clan names : 100 % IA	11	11	0	11	0	11	0	0	0
	%	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

IV) **ᶜĀmar — name : IA**

Clans - 1	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) ᶜĀmar (IA)	**8**	**6**	**2**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Clan names : 100 % IA	**8**	**6**	**2**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**1**
	%	**75.00**	**25.00**	**87.50**	**12.50**	**75.00**	**0.00**	**12.50**	**12.50**

V) a) **Sāḥil sh-Shimālī — name : IIA**

Clans - 1	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Sāḥil sh-Shimālī (IIA)	**9**	**7**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**2**
Clan names : 100 % IIA	**9**	**7**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**2**
	%	**77.78**	**22.22**	**44.45**	**55.55**	**44.45**	**33.33**	**0.00**	**22.22**

V) b) **Sāḥil l-Junūbī**

Clans - 3	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Dshār r-Ruwāḥ (IIA)	8	6	2	3	5	2	4	1	1
2) Dshār l-Jdīd (IIA)	7	7	0	4	3	4	3	0	0
3) r-Rqāda (IA)	6	5	1	6	0	5	0	1	0
Clan names : 33.33 % IA, 66.67 % IIA	21	18	3	13	8	11	7	2	1
	%	85.71	14.29	61.91	38.09	52.38	33.33	9.52	4.77

V) Total) **Sāḥil** - Total — name : IIA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
I) sh-Shimālī — 1	9	7	2	4	5	4	3	0	2
II) l-Junūbī — 3	21	18	3	13	8	11	7	2	1
Total clan names : 25 % IA, 75 % IIA	30	25	5	17	13	15	10	2	3
	%	83.33	16.67	56.67	43.33	50.00	33.33	6.67	10.00

VI) **l-Khlūṭ — name : IA**

	Clans - 9	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1	1) Jāmiᶜ ṭ-Ṭulbā l-Junūbī (IA) .	22	20	2	21	1	20	0	1	1
	2) Jāmiᶜ ṭ-Ṭulbā sh-Shimātī (IA)	21	20	1	19	2	18	2	1	0
2	3) l-Qṣar r-Rabāl (IIA)	12	12	0	7	5	7	5	0	0
	4) l-Qṣar l-Ḥadd (IIA)	28	25	3	25	3	23	2	2	1
	5) l-Qṣar d-Daḥs (IIA)	17	15	2	16	1	14	1	2	0
3	6) ᶜAwāmra sh-Sharqīya (IA) ...	18	15	3	16	2	13	2	3	0
	7) ᶜAwāmra l-Gharbīya (IA)	21	18	3	17	4	14	4	3	0
4	8) Tlāta Raisāna sh-Shimālī (IIA)	18	13	5	16	2	13	0	3	2
	9) Tlāta Raisāna l-Junūbī (IIA) .	15	15	0	12	3	12	3	0	0
	Clan names : 44.45 % IA, 55.55 % IIA	172	153	19	149	23	134	19	15	4
		%	88.96	11.04	86.63	13.37	77.90	11.04	8.72	2.34

VII) **Ūlād Stūt** (52) — name : IA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Ūlād d-Dāwudī (IA)	3	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	0
2) l-Mawādīn (IIA)	7	6	1	6	1	5	1	1	0
3) Ūlād Bū Yiḥyā (IA)	4	3	1	4	0	3	0	1	0
4) Ūlād sh-Shīkh (IA)	4	4	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
Clan names : 75 % IA, 25 % IIA	18	16	2	17	1	15	1	2	0
	%	88.89	11.11	94.44	5.56	83.33	5.56	11.11	0.00

(52) This tribe forms a geographically intrusive enclave in the Eastern Rif, on the west bank of the Mulwīya River ; it is, however, not Rifian at all from an ethnic origins standpoint, but as Bedouin as the Lukkūs groups, and falls entirely into the Lukkūs mean statistically.

GHMĀRA

I) **Bnī Zīyāt — name : IA** (53)

Clans - 10	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Hlīl (IA)	8	3	5	3	5	1	2	2	3
2) Bnī Bārūn (IA)	4	3	1	1	3	0	2	1	1
3) Bnī Būddās (IA)	9	2	7	4	5	1	1	3	4
4) Bnī Bakht (IA)	9	4	5	2	7	1	3	1	4
5) Bnī Jilla (IA)	3	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	1
6) Bnī Ghafar (IA)	8	1	7	2	6	0	1	2	5
7) Bū Rmān (IIA)	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
8) Bnī Gillūn (IA)	7	1	6	4	3	0	1	4	2
9) Qāᶜasrās (IIB)	9	1	8	6	3	0	1	6	2
10) Targa (IIB)	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
Clan names : 70 % IA, 10 % IIA, 20 % IIB	60	18	42	22	38	3	14	19	24
	%	30.00	70.00	26.67	73.33	5.00	23.33	31.67	40.00

(53) Although all nine Ghmāran tribes are considered by their members to be descended from the 9 sons of the Fqīh Aghmīr (hence the name *Ghmāra*) and thus, as it were, to form nine clans of a single « tribe » ; and although they are all indisputably of Berber origin (having switched to Arabic speech only in relatively modern times), these facts are not necessarily reflected in their names, which are all Arabic or Arabic-derived, nor in all the names of their clans. For the sake of consistency with our material on the Jbāla and Lukkūs groups, we should proceed here on the basis of names *alone*. In any case, such scanty historical data as is available does support, and very substantially so, the results of my statistical analysis, at least on the « grass-roots » levels of village and clan ; for, as mentioned above, it is probable that the linguistic Arabization of the Ghmāra occurred as late as the span between the 16th and 18th centuries.

Etymology of Bnī Zīyāt : suggestive of Rifian *thazīyāt*, « bottle » (?).

II) **Bnī Būzra** — name : IA (54)

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB	IA + Latin ending
1) Tandāmān (IIB)	4	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0
2) Bnī Manslīmān (IA)	11	3	8	6	5	2	1	4	4	0
3) l-Wisṭīyīn (IA)	7	3	4	1	6	0	3	1	3	1
4) Bnī Mūsā (IA)	15	9	6	3	12	2	7	1	5	1
Clan names : 75 % IA, 25 % IIB	37	17	20	12	25	6	11	6	14	2
	%	45.95	54.05	32.43	67.57	16.22	29.73	16.22	37.83	5.40

(54) This tribe is today the only one in Ghmāra which is, at least in theory, almost entirely Berber-speaking — except for the clan of Tandāmān, which has shifted to Arabic in the last 30 years. Paradoxically enough, however, not only does Bnī Būzra show a higher « Arabic » frequency ratio than any others, but its only clan with a Berber name (Tandāmān, « lagoon of water ») is the one Arabic-speaking segment ! At one point I might have thought that such facts would prove a great obstacle to a study of this kind, and that against such an argument the strong probability that the bulk of the male population, at least, of Bnī Būzra *know* Arabic would have been small consolation ; but upon further reflection (and perhaps rationalization) I now consider it yet another example of the fact that names alone are by no means always a clue, in themselves, to ethnic origins.

III) **Bnī Silmān** — name : IA

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Asīfān (IIB) (55)	8	0	8	1	7	0	0	1	7
2) l-Wisṭīyīn (IA)	12	6	6	5	7	2	4	3	3
3) Bnī Bū Ḥlū (IA)	5	2	3	4	1	2	0	2	1
4) Bnī Ḥlū (IA)	12	4	8	5	7	2	2	3	5
5) Bnī Fanzar (IA)	19	5	14	6	13	1	4	5	9
Clan names : 80 % IA, 20 % IIB	56	17	39	21	35	7	10	14	25
	%	30.36	69.64	37.39	62.61	12.50	17.50	25.00	45.00

IV) **Bnī Zjil** — name : IA

Clans - 7	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Bū Shiddād (IA)	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	5
2) l-Qalʿa (IIA)	10	2	8	9	1	1	1	8	0
3) l-Wisṭīyīn (IA)	5	0	5	2	3	0	0	2	3
4) Bnī Manṣūr (IA)	7	2	5	2	5	1	1	1	4
5) Bnī Shkūra (IA)	10	3	7	3	7	1	2	2	5
6) Bnī Simlūla (IA)	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	5
7) Bnī Mūsā (IA)	4	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2
Clan names : 85.17 % IA, 14.29 % IIA	46	9	37	18	28	5	4	13	24
	%	19.13	80.87	39.13	60.87	10.96	8.61	28.26	52.17

(55) A clan name meaning « rivers » in the Berber dialects of the Western High, Central High and Eastern High Atlases.

V) ***Bnī Khālid*** *— name : IA*

Clans - 6	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Khiyār (IA)	9	4	5	4	5	3	2	1	3
2) Bnī Nbāt (IA)	14	3	11	3	11	0	3	3	8
3) ᶜAbd l-ᶜAzīz (IA)	15	5	10	5	10	2	3	3	7
4) Bnī ᶜĀṣim (IA)	18	7	11	10	8	3	4	7	4
5) Bnī ᶜAmrān (IA)	10	3	7	7	3	1	2	6	1
6) Bnī Zrawlaw (IA)	9	5	4	2	7	1	4	1	3
Clan names : 100 % IA	75	27	48	31	44	10	18	21	26
	%	36.00	64.00	41.33	58.67	13.33	24.00	28.00	34.67

VI) **Bnī Manṣūr** — name : IA

Clans - 6	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Inswān (IB)	4	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	0
2) Bnī ᶜArūs (IA) (56)	7	1	6	3	4	1	0	2	4
3) Afrān Amān (IIB)	5	1	4	0	5	0	1	0	4
4) Bnī Bzūz (IA - matronymic?)	7	1	6	1	6	1	0	0	6
5) Wutilga (Wutliga) (IIA)	5	1	4	2	3	0	1	2	2
6) Bnī Ukta (IA)	5	2	3	3	2	2	0	1	2
Clan names : 50 % IA, 16.67 % IIA, 16.67 % IB, 16.66 % IIB	33	8	25	12	21	5	3	7	18
	%	24.24	75.76	36.36	63.64	15.15	9.09	21.21	54.55

(56) The clan of Bnī ᶜArūs is Berber-speaking ; the other 5 clans of Bnī Manṣūr all speak Arabic.

VII) **Bnī Grīr** — name : IA

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Ḥamā un (IA)	5	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	1
2) Bnī l-Ḥajj (IA)	8	3	5	3	5	1	2	2	3
3) Bnī Siggūd (IA)	10	4	6	3	7	1	3	2	4
4) Bnī Krāma (IA) (57)	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
Clan names : 100 % IA	25	9	16	9	16	3	6	6	10
	%	36.00	64.00	36.00	64.00	12.00	24.00	24.00	40.00

VIII) **Bnī Smīḥ** — name : IA (58)

Clans - 4	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Siddrāt (IB) (59)	4	0	4	3	1	0	0	3	1
2) Bnī Yazrif (IB) (60)	10	3	7	3	7	0	3	3	4
3) Bū Digfān (IA)	9	2	7	2	7	1	1	1	6
4) Bnī Bū Zkrī (IA)	5	1	4	4	1	1	0	3	1
Clan names : 50 % IA, 50 % IB	28	6	22	12	16	2	4	10	12
	%	21.43	78.57	42.86	57.14	7.13	14.29	35.72	42.86

(57) Probably derived from the tribe of Bnī Krāma in the south-astern Jbāla, Wargha River area ; this and further examples cited below show the Ghmāran notion of common descent from a single ancestor to be, if not a polite fiction, at least a notion which has become greatly obscured.

(58) Could this name possibly be Jewish ?

(59) This name evokes the Ait Siddrāt of the Upper Draᶜ and Todgha Gorge region, and lends a vague support to another Ghmāran origin tradition, that of having « come from the Sūs » (for » Sūs », read « south »).

(60) *Azrif*, « road, way, customary law », in the Berber dialects of the Central and Eastern Atlas, and also in that of the Ṣanhāja Srīr. This clan name again points vaguely to the south as a possible point of origin.

IX) **Bnī Rzīn** — name : IA

Clans - 5	Total Villages	A	B	I	II	IA	IIA	IB	IIB
1) Bnī Murrāq (IA)	7	1	6	4	3	0	1	4	2
2) Awfās (IIB)	4	0	4	2	2	0	0	2	2
3) Tamrīkht (IIB)	6	1	5	1	5	1	0	0	5
4) Bnī Qāsim (IA)	4	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	2
5) l-Wisṭī (IA)	8	3	5	2	6	1	2	1	4
Clan names : 60 % IA, 40 % IIB	29	6	23	11	18	3	3	8	15
	%	20.69	79.31	37.93	62.07	10.34	10.34	27.59	51.73

— VII —

All that is needed in summation is a few general observations on the directional trends which the above statistical columns shows in terms of frequency.

I) *Jbāla :* On the A-B plane, the tribes of the Northwestern Jbāla (Anjra, l-Ḥauz, Wadrās, Bnī Mṣawwar, l-Faḥṣ Isbānī, Jbil Ḥbīb, Bnī Yīdir and Bnī Gurfāṭ) show a very high percentage (over 90 % in all cases save Jbil Ḥbīb, and a total average of 95 %) in the A colomn and a correspondingly very low, indeed almost infinitesimal, percentage in the B column. For these tribes, the A-B ratio is 95-5. The Berber linguistic residue in the Northwestern Jbāla is at best very negligible, and Colin's Latin plural suffix factor, on the village or lineage level, is at its highest in just this area. (The Faḥṣ tribe of Tangier, which does not figure in this survey, is another matter entirely : although culturally and linguistically Jbālan today, its ethnic origins have been estimated at 85 % Rīfian, with corresponding ethnic and toponymic residues.)

In the rest of the Jbāla, however (Bnī ᶜArūs, Sumāta, Ahl Srīf, Bnī Yīsif, Bnī Zakkār, Bnī Ḥuzmar, Bnī Ḥassān, Bnī Lāyit, Bnī Saᶜīd, the two l-Khmās tribes — s-Siflī and l-ᶜĀlī, Ghzāwa and Bnī Ḥmid s-Surrāq), the picture changes quite considerably, and except for Ahl Srīf, the number of Berber names increases sharply to an average of some 44 % of the total, and Arabic goes down to 56 % ; in the two l-Khmās tribes between them, rather than separately, the A-B ratio balances evenly at 50 %. In another tribe, Bnī Saᶜīd, the B factor shoots up to 75 %, thus raising the average of the whole sub-area not a little — this may be explained either through the fact that 1) Bnī Saᶜīd is on the western border of the Ghmāra coast, in the area around Wād Lāu, and that it shows heavy Ghmāran influence in this respect, the B factor in Ghmāra being far higher than in Jbāla; or that 2) as a few of its village names suggest, it shows certain unmistakeable Rīfian influences; or through 3) a combination of both, this last being most problbly the case (61). (In Bnī Saᶜīd also, the clan

(61) Rīfian nomenclature influences in Bnī Saᶜīd Jbāla include the villages of *r-Rīfiyīn*, « the Rīfians », in clan Msā, *Iḥarmūshen*, Rīfian for « boys » (sing. *aḥarmūsh*) in clan Warrāq, and possibly a number of other *I—X—n* forms, though the bulk of these are probably Ghmāran. There is, however, no linkage of kind any between this tribe and that of Aith Saᶜīd in the Easthern Rīf, as aforementioned.

name of Bnī Bizzāz may be possible evidence of a matronym, a fact which, however, if true, would in no way weaken the principle of patrilineal descent.) The Latin plural suffix factor is also present in some of the tribes of the southeastern Jbāla, but its frequency, compared to the Northest, is greatly reduced.

On the I-II plane, the frequencies for the whole Jbālan area are fairly constant, with an area-wide 40-60 ratio in favor of the II factor.

An overall average for the Jbāla on village or lineage names gives us : A—73% ; B—27% ; I—40% ; II—60% ; IA—32% ; IIA—40% ; IB—9% ; and IIB—19%. A clan name analysis for the 20 Jbālan tribes gives us the following reading : A—75 %; B—25% ; I—55% ; II—45% ; IA—47% ; IIA—28%; IB—9%; IIB—16%. And a tribal name analysis produces : A—80%; B—20%; I—75%; II—25%; IA—50%; IIA—25%; IB—25%; and IIB—0%.

II) *Habṭ or Lukkūs :* On the A-B plane, this group (l-Gharbīya, Mzūra-Bdāwa, Bdūr, ᶜĀmar, the two Sāḥils, and l-Khlūṭ) shows an overall average of 90-10 in favor of the A factor, and, on the I-II plane, a 70-30 average in favor of the II factor. This is not surprising — although the Arabic factor predominates in both Jbāla and Habṭ, lineage names in the latter area are more common than place names, by a very considerable margin. This, among people who were once Bedouins, is to be expected. There is only one lineage here with a Latin plural suffix, in l-Gharbīya, and it can probably be accounted for through proximity to the Northwestern Jbāla. Falling very nicely into the whole Habṭ mean is the tribe of Ūlād Stūt, the intrusive Bedouin group on the west bank of the Mulwīya River in the Eastern Rīf.

Overall averages on a village name analysis, for the Habṭ, give us : A—90% ; B—10% ; I—82% ; II—18% ; IA—75% ; IIA—13% ; IB—8% ; IIB—4%. On a clan name analysis : IA—58%; and IIA—42%. On a tribal name analysis : IA—63%; IIA—25%; and IB—12%.

III) *Ghmāra :* In the nine tribes of Ghmāra (Bnī Ziyāt, Bnī Silmān, Bnī Zjil, Bnī Khālid, Bnī Manṣūr, Bnī Grīr, Bnī Smīḥ and Bnī Rzīn), on the A-B plane, the situation is very different from both the Jbāla and

the Habṭ, and the frequency average is 30-70 in favor of the B factor. In Ghmāra, we have not only moved east, but into an area which is also a linguistic « refuge area » for Shilḥa Būzratīya ; and the Berber factor becomes much higher. As aforesaid, Caro Baroja thinks (and I agree with him) that the linguistic Arabization of the Ghmāra was a relatively late phenomenon in time.

Oddly enough, on the basis of names alone, the B factor is lowest in the tribe of Bnī Būzra, the only one of the whole group which still remains largely Berber-speaking; and another anomaly in connection with this tribe is that in it we find the only place name with a Latin plural suffix well outside the Jbāla or its immediate environs. The presence of this name (*Jnānesh*) is difficult to account for in any *a priori* manner.

On the I-II plane, the ratio for the whole of Ghmāra is 36-64 in favor of the II factor. This is a slightly higher II ratio than in the Jbāla, and indeed it is the highest II in all Northern Morocco, Ṣanhāja Srīr and Rīf included.

Overall averages on a village name analysis, for the Ghmāra, give us : A—30%; B—70%; I—36%; II—64%; IA—11%; IIA—18%; IB—27%; IIB—44%. On a clan name analysis : IA—78%; IIA—7%; IB—4%; and IIB—11%. On a tribal name analysis — with always the reservation that these are Berber tribes, but on the basis of names alone : IA—100%.

IV) *Ṣanhāja Srīr :* In the nine tribes of the Ṣanhāja Srīr (Bnī Saddāt, Ktāma, Taghzūt, Bnī Bu Shībt, Bnī Ḥmid, Bnī Bū Nṣār, Bnī Khannūs, Zarqāt and Bnī Bshīr (62), as in Ghmāra, we have a 29-71 ratio in favor of the B factor, on the A-B plane. On the I-II plane, the Ṣanhāja average is 45-55; here the I factor, although still nosed out by the II, gains more ground than it did in Ghmāra. One tribe, the entirely Arabic-speaking group of Bnī Bū Shībt, has what may be a Berber lineage matronym (Ibizzāzen, in the clan of Shwāḥil or Swāḥil).

(62) It must be noted that for the Ṣanhāja Srīr, Modified Rīf and Rīf Proper, tribal, clan and village or lineage names have been analyzed according to the form, whether purely Berber, Arabized or Arabic, that they occur in the *Nombres de los Musulmanes... etc.* From a statistical standpoint, therefore, a tribal or clan name occurring officially, and thus in the text of the above-mentioned work, as *Bnī X* rather than *Aith X* has in these instances been analyzed as such, to ensure greater consistency and data control. Even so, the Berber factor predominates by a very wide margin. This issue does not rise in the Jbāla, Habṭ and Ghmāra.

On an overall village name analysis, we have the following results : A—29%; B—71%; I—45%; II—55%; IA—16%; IIA—13%; IB—26%; IIB—45%. On a clan name analysis : IA—30%; IIA—38%; IB—7%; and IIB—25 %. On a tribal name analysis : IA—45 % ; IIA—11 % ; IB—33%; IIB—11%.

V) *Western, Transitional, Modified or Arabized Rīf :* In the essentially Arabic-speaking groups of the Western or Modified Rīf (Mtīwa dyāl Bḥar, Mistāsa, Bnī Gmīl, Targīst, Bnī Bū Frāḥ and Bnī Yiṭṭuft, as well as the mixed Ṣanhājan-Rīfian tribe of Bnī Mazdūyī), who do not fall readily into any one group or the other — although three of them (Bnī Bū Frāḥ, Bnī Yiṭṭuft and Bnī Mazdūyī) are predominantly Rīfian, with the rest showing certain Rīfian influences, we have, on the A-B plane, a 35-65 ratio in favor of B, slightly less than in either Ghmāra or Ṣanhāja Srīr. On the I-II plane, the result is 46-64 in favor of the II factor.

On an overall village name analysis, we have the following : A—35%; B—65%; I—46%; II—54%; IA—13%; IIA—23%; IB—20%; IIB—30%. On a clan name analysis : IA—35%; IIA—15%; IB—20%; IIB—30%. On a tribal name analysis : IA—29%; IIA—14%; IB—43%; IIB—14%.

VI) *Rīf Proper :* In the Rīf Proper, the overall average for the whole area (all tribes except Ūlād Stūt, which for reasons given above has been grouped with the Habṭ) is, on the A-B plane, 29-71, as in Ṣanhāja Srīr. For the Central Rīf (Buqqūya, Bnī ʿAmmart, Bnī Waryāghal, Gzinnāya, Timsāmān and Bnī Tūzīn), the B factor is quite naturally (for this is the Berber region par excellence of the Moroccan North) higher than anywhere else in the whole area, 77 %, as opposed to 23 % for the A factor. This is what maintains the overall 29-71 average for in the Eastern Rīf, owing to the presence of the seminomads of Mṭālsa (Rīfian *Ibdhārsen*) and Bnī Bū Yiḥyī, and particularly Kibdāna, in which the A factor is higher than the B (57 % — 43 %), the A-B average is 34-66. On the I-II plane, the overall Rīfian average is 65-35, and thus in the Rīf, anthroponyms prevail over toponyms. In the Central Rīf, it is 52-48, almost even, and in the East, 75-25 ; lineage names are commonest among the two seminomad groups, as are also lineage matronyms, which show both Arabic and Berber features.

On a village name analysis for the Central Rīf, we have : A—23%; B—77%; I—52%; II—48%; IA—14%; IIA—12%; IB—44%; IIB—32%. On a clan name analysis : IA—48%; IIA—6%; IB—23%; and IIB—23%. On a tribal analysis : IA—0%; IIA—16%; IB—50%; and IIB—34%.

On a village name analysis for the Eastern Rīf, we have : A—35%; B—65%; I—75%; II—25%; IA—28%; IIA—10%; IB—52%; IIB—10%. On a clan name analysis : IA—38%; IIA—16%; IB—43%; IIB—3%. On a tribal name analysis : IA—45%; IIA—9%; IB—36%; and IIB—10%.

Finally, on a village name analysis for the Rīf as a whole, we have : A—29%; B—71%; I—65%; II—35%; IA—21%; IIA—10%; IB—48%; and IIB—21%. On a clan name analysis : IA—41%; IIA—13%; IB—36%; and IIB—10%. And on a tribal name analysis, we have : IA—29%; IIA—12%; IB—41%; and IIB—18%.

VII) *Summary :* Within each of the two largest of the various culture or sub-culture areas in Northern Morocco, Jbāla and Rīf Proper, we may note two distinct sub- (or sub-sub-, if you will) areas to which the frequency ratios of names attest. In the Jbāla, a *Northwestern* area in which Arabic names are at a maximum and Berber ones at a minimum, and a *South-eastern* area in which the Berber factor, although still less than the Arabic one percentage-wise, tends to rise up very sharply and to make the A-B ratio more even. In two sub-areas of the Rīf Proper, *Central* and *Eastern*, we find the reverse situation; Arabic names are at their smallest minimum in the Central Rīf, while they show a certain increase in the East. The anthroponym-toponym level remains uniform throughout all Jbāla, while in the Eastern Rīf lineage names show a marked increase from the almost 50-50 ratio of the Central Rīf.

In general, the A-B plane throughout the whole of Northern Morocco corresponds with amazing exactitude to actual linguistic distribution. Even in the Central Rīf, there are more Arabic names than there are Berber ones in the Habṭ or in the Northwestern Jbāla, for instance — a testimony to the fact that Arabic influences on Berber, both linguistic and cultural, have always been greater than the reverse.

On the I-II level, we see the same degree of linguistic and ecological consistency, for generally speaking, the I factor predominates more in the flatlands (much of the Eastern Rīf is relatively flat, for example) and the II factor in the mountains. Indeed, we may almost say of Northern Morocco in general that the higher the mountains are, the more toponyms tend to predominate over anthroponyms. We find, for example, a slightly higher incidence of the toponyms factor in Ghmāra or Ṣanhāja Srīr then even in the Central Rīf — and in both these areas, the mountains are higher incidence of the toponyms factor in Ghmāra or Ṣanhāja Srīr then slightly higher, and the valleys deeper than in the Central Rīf. In this respect, Ghmāra shows the highest toponymical frequency of all.

To my mind, the foregoing analysis of the frequencies of Arabic and Berber anthroponyms and toponyms appears to bear out and support the findings of linguistics and ethnography in Northern Morocco remarkably well, with a high correlation in all respects.

It only remains to be said now that the immediate goal of this analysis has been purely one of tabulation and assessment, on a percentage basis, of the material available to me. Ultimately, however, if its conclusions, which are given here purely tentatively, can be used in any way as tools toward historical reconstruction of some of the pressing linguistic and ethnographic problems which are basic to the area, I shall feel that this paper has more than accomplished its purpose.

David Montgomery HART.